RUSSIA AND THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

By the same Author

THE MEANING OF LOVE

VLADIMIR SOLOVYEV

RUSSIA AND THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

LONDON
GEOFFREY BLES . THE CENTENARY PRESS
MCMXLVIII

TRANSLATED BY HERBERT REES

CONTENTS

PART THREE
THE TRINITARY PRINCIPLE AND ITS SOCIAL APPLICATION

INTRODUCTION

A HUNDRED years ago France, the vanguard of humanity, set out to inaugurate a new era with the proclamation of the Rights of Man. Christianity had indeed many centuries earlier conferred upon men not only the right but the power to become the sons of God — εδωκεν αυτοις εξουσιαν τεκνα Θεου γενεσθαι (John i. 12). But the new proclamation made by France was far from superfluous, for this supreme power of mankind was almost entirely ignored in the social life of Christendom. I am not referring so much to particular acts of injustice as to the principles which were recognized by the public conscience, expressed in the laws of the time, and embodied in its social institutions. It was by legal statute that Christian America robbed the Christian negroes of all their human rights and ruthlessly abandoned them to the tyranny of their masters who themselves professed the Christian religion. In God-fearing England it was the law which condemned to the gallows the man who stole food from his rich neighbor to save himself from starvation. Lastly, it was the laws and institutions of Poland and of "Holy" Russia which allowed the feudal lord to sell his serfs like cattle.[1] I do not presume to pass judgment on the special circumstances of France, nor to decide whether, as distinguished writers more competent than myself declare,[2] the Revolution did this country more harm than good. But let us not forget that if each nation in history works more or less for the whole world, France has the distinction of having taken a step of universal significance in the political and social sphere.

Though the revolutionary movement destroyed many things that needed to be destroyed, though it swept away many an injustice and swept it away forever, it nevertheless failed lamentably in the attempt to create a social order founded upon justice. Justice is simply the practical expression and application of truth; and the starting-point of the revolutionary movement was false. The declaration of the Rights of Man could only provide a positive principle for social reconstruction if it was based upon a true conception of Man himself. That of the revolutionaries is

[1] I am not forgetting that in 1861 Russia made amends by freeing the serfs.
[2] See, among recent publications, the remarkable work of G. de Pascal, *Révolution ou Evolution: Centenaire de 1789* (Paris, Saudax).

well-known: they perceived in Man nothing but abstract individuality, a rational being destitute of all positive content.

I do not propose to unmask the internal contradictions of this revolutionary individualism nor to show how this abstract "Man" was suddenly transformed into the no less abstract "Citizen," how the free sovereign individual found himself doomed to be the defenseless slave and victim of the absolute State or "Nation," that is to say, of a group of obscure persons borne to the surface of public life by the eddies of revolution and rendered the more ferocious by the consciousness of their own intrinsic nonentity. No doubt it would be highly interesting and instructive to follow the thread of logic which connects the doctrines of 1789 with the events of 1793. But I believe it to be still more important to recognize that the πρωτον ψευδος, the basic falsehood, of the Revolution — the conception of the individual man as a being complete in and for himself — that this false notion of individualism was not the invention of the revolutionaries or of their spiritual forbears, the Encyclopædists, but was the logical, though unforeseen, issue of an earlier pseudo-Christian or semi-Christian doctrine which has been the root cause of all the anomalies in the past history and present state of Christendom.

Men have imagined that the acknowledgment of the divinity of Christ relieves them of the obligation of taking His words seriously. They have twisted certain texts of the Gospel so as to get out of them the meaning they want, while they have conspired to pass over in silence other texts which do not lend themselves to such treatment. The precept "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's" is constantly quoted to sanction an order of things which gives Cæsar all and God nothing. The saying "My Kingdom is not of this world" is always being used to justify and confirm the paganism of our social and political life, as though Christian society were destined to belong to this world and not to the Kingdom of Christ. On the other hand, the saying "All power is given Me in Heaven and Earth" is never quoted. Men are ready to accept Christ as sacrificing Priest and atoning Victim; but they do not want Christ the King. His royal dignity has been ousted by every kind of pagan despotism, and Christian peoples have taken up the cry of the Jewish rabble: "We have no king but Cæsar!" Thus history has witnessed, and we are still witnessing, the curious phenomenon of a society which professes Christianity as its religion but remains pagan not merely in its life but in the very basis of that life.

This dichotomy is not so much a logical *non sequitur* as a moral failure. That is obvious from the hypocrisy and sophistry which are characteristic of the arguments commonly used to justify this state of affairs. "Slavery and severe hardship," said a bishop renowned in Russia thirty years ago, "are not contrary to the spirit of Christianity; for physical suffering is not a hindrance to the salvation of the soul, which is the one and only end of our religion." As though the infliction of physical

suffering by a man on his fellow-men did not imply in him a moral depravity and an act of injustice and cruelty which were certainly imperilling the salvation of *his* soul! Granted even — though the supposition is absurd — that a Christian society can be insensible to the sufferings of the oppressed, the question remains whether it can be indifferent to the sin of the oppressors.

Economic slavery, even more than slavery properly so called, has found its champions in the Christian world. Society and the State, they maintain, are in no way bound to take general and regular measures against pauperism; voluntary almsgiving is enough; did not Christ say that there would always be the poor on Earth? Yes, there will always be the poor; there will also always be the sick, but does that prove the uselessness of health services? Poverty in itself is no more an evil than sickness; the evil consists in remaining indifferent to the sufferings of one's neighbor. And it is not a question only of the poor; the rich also have a claim on our compassion. These poor rich! We do everything to develop their bump of acquisitiveness, and then we expect them to enter the Kingdom of God through the imperceptible opening of individual charity. Besides, it is well known that authoritative scholars see in the phrase "the eye of a needle" simply a literal translation of the Hebrew name given to one of the gates of Jerusalem *(negeb-ha-khammath* or *khur-ha-khammath)* which it was difficult for camels to pass through. Surely, then, it is not the infinitesimal contribution of personal philanthropy which the Gospel enjoins upon the rich, but rather the narrow and difficult, but nevertheless practicable, way of social reform.

This desire to limit the social action of Christianity to individual charity, this attempt to deprive the Christian moral code of its binding character and its positive legal sanction is a modern version of that ancient Gnostic antithesis (the system of Marcion, in particular) so often anathematized by the Church. That all human relationships should be governed by charity and brotherly love is undoubtedly the express will of God and the end of His creation; but in historic reality, as in the Lord's Prayer, the fulfilment of the divine will on Earth is only realized after the hallowing of God's Name and the coming of His Kingdom. The Name of God is Truth; His Kingdom is Justice. It follows that the knowledge of the truth and the practice of justice are necessary conditions for the triumph of evangelical charity in human society.

In truth, all are one; and God, the absolute Unity, is all in all. But this divine Unity is hidden from our view by the world of evil and illusion, the result of universal human sin. The basic condition of this world is the division and isolation of the parts of the Great Whole; and even Man, who should have been the unifying rationale of the material universe, finds himself split up and scattered over the Earth, and has been unable by his own efforts to achieve more than a partial and unstable unity, the universal monarchy of paganism. This monarchy, first

represented by Tiberius and Nero, received its true unifying principle when grace and truth were manifested in Jesus Christ. Once united to God, the human race recovered its own unity. But this unity had to be threefold to be complete; it had to realize its ideal perfection on the basis of a divine fact and in the midst of the life of mankind. Since mankind is objectively separated from the divine unity, this unity must in the first place be given to us as an objective reality independent of ourselves — the Kingdom of God coming amongst us, the external, objective Church. But once reunited to this external unity, men must translate it into action, they must assimilate it by their own efforts — the Kingdom of God is to be taken by force, and the men of violence possess it. At first manifested *for* us and then *by* us, the Kingdom of God must finally be revealed *in* us in all its intrinsic, absolute perfection as love, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

Thus the Church Universal (in the broad sense of the word) develops as a threefold union of the divine and the human: there is the priestly union, in which the divine element, absolute and unchangeable, predominates and forms the Church properly so called (the Temple of God); there is the kingly union, in which the human element predominates and which forms the Christian State (the Church as the living Body of God); and there is lastly the prophetic union, in which the divine and the human must penetrate one another in free mutual interaction and so form the perfect Christian society (the Church as the Spouse of God).

The moral basis of the priestly union, or of the Church in the strict sense of the word, is faith and religious devotion; the kingly union of the Christian State is based on law and justice; while the element proper to the prophetic union or the perfect society is freedom and love.

The Church, in the narrower sense, represented by the hierarchy, re-unites mankind to God by the profession of the true faith and the grace of the sacraments. But if the faith communicated by the Church to Christian humanity is a living faith, and if the grace of the sacraments is an effectual grace, the resultant union of the divine and the human cannot be limited to the special domain of religion, but must extend to all Man’s common relationships and must regenerate and transform his social and political life. Here opens up a field of action which is man’s own proper sphere. The divine-human action is no longer an accomplished fact, as in the priestly Church, but a task awaiting fulfilment, the task of making the divine Truth a reality in human society, of putting Truth into practice; and Truth, expressed in practice, is called Justice.

Truth is the absolute existence of all in unity; it is the universal solidarity which exists eternally in God, but which has been lost by the natural man and recovered in principle by Christ, the spiritual Man. It remains for human activity to continue the unifying work of the God-Man by contesting the world with the contrary principle of egoism and division. Each single being, whether nation, class, or

individual, in so far as it asserts its own individuality in isolation from the divine-human sum of things, is acting against Truth; and Truth, if it is alive in us, must react and manifest itself as Justice. Thus having recognized the universal solidarity, the All-in-One, as Truth, and having put it into practice as Justice, regenerate Man will be able to perceive it as his inmost essence and to enjoy it fully in the spirit of freedom and love.

All are one in the Church through the unity of hierarchy, faith, and sacraments; all are made one in the Christian State through justice and law; all must be one in natural charity and free co-operation. These three modes, or rather degrees, of unity are inseparably connected. In order to impose that universal solidarity which is the Kingdom of God on nations and classes and individuals, the Christian State must believe in it as absolute Truth revealed by God Himself. But the divine revelation cannot be made directly to the State as such, that is to say, to a natural humanity outside the sphere of the divine operation: God has revealed Himself, He has entrusted His truth and His grace to an elect humanity, that is, to the Church, sanctified and organized by Himself. If the State, itself the product of human agencies and historic circumstances, is to bring mankind under the sway of absolute Justice, it must justify itself by submission to the Church which provides the moral and religious sanction and the actual basis for its work. It is equally clear that the perfect Christian society, or the prophetic union, the reign of love and spiritual freedom, presupposes the priestly and kingly union. For the divine truth and grace cannot fully control the moral being of mankind nor effect its inner transformation unless they first have an objective force in the world, unless they are incarnate in a religious fact and upheld by law, unless, that is, they exist as Church and State.

Since the priestly institution is a fact, and the brotherhood of perfect freedom is an ideal, it is the middle term especially — the State in its relation to Christianity — which determines the historic destiny of mankind. The State exists in order to protect human society against evil in its external and public form — that is, against manifest evil. The true social good being the solidarity of the whole, universal justice and peace, social evil is simply the violation of this solidarity. The actual life of mankind shows a threefold violation of that universal solidarity which is justice: justice is violated, firstly, when one nation attacks the existence or freedom of another, secondly, when one social class oppresses another, and thirdly, when an individual by committing a crime openly revolts against the social order.

As long as there existed in the history of mankind several separate States, absolutely independent of one another, the immediate task of each in the sphere of foreign policy was confined to maintaining this independence. But the ideal or rather the instinct of international solidarity persisted throughout human history, and found its expression either in that tendency to universal monarchy which

culminated in the ideal and the historic reality of the *pax Romana,* or (among the Jews) in the religious principle which affirmed the natural unity and common origin of the whole human race, of all the sons of Adam *(bene-Adam)* — a conception afterwards completed by the Christian religion which added to this natural unity the spiritual fellowship of all those who are regenerate and made sons of the second Adam, the Christ *(bene-Mashiah)*.

This new ideal was realized, however incompletely, in medieval Christendom, which despite its turbulent condition did, as a rule, regard any war between Christian peoples as a civil war and therefore as a sin and a crime. The modern nations, having shattered the papal monarchy which was the foundation of this imperfect but genuine unity, have had to substitute for the ideal of Catholic Christendom the fiction of the European balance of power. On all hands it is recognized, whether sincerely or not, that the true objective of international politics must be universal peace.

Two equally obvious facts, then, are to be noted: first, that there exists a general consciousness of the solidarity of mankind and a desire for international unity, for the *pax Christiana* or, if you will, the *pax humana;* secondly, that this unity does not exist in fact, and that the first of the three problems of society is as far from being solved at the present day as it was in the ancient world. The same is true of the other two problems.

Universal solidarity implies that each element of the sum total — each nation, society or individual — not only has the right to exist, but possesses in addition a peculiar and intrinsic worth which forbids its being treated as a mere means to the general well-being. The true positive conception of justice can be expressed in the following formula: each particular being, whether collective or individual, has always a place to itself in the universal organism of the race. This positive justice was unknown to the ancient State; the State protected itself and maintained the social order by exterminating its enemies in war, reducing its laboring class to a condition of slavery, and torturing or killing its criminals. Christianity, regarding every human being as of infinite worth, was bound to bring about a complete change in the character and action of the State. The ills of society remained the same, in their threefold form: international, civil, and criminal; the State, as before, had to fight evil in these three spheres, but the specific objective and the methods of the struggle could not remain the same. It was no longer a matter of defending a particular social group; this negative aim was replaced by a positive task; universal solidarity had to be established in the face of national differences; there had to be a reaction against class-antagonism and individual egoism in the name of true social justice. The pagan State had to deal with the enemy, the slave and the criminal; the enemy, the slave and the criminal had no rights. But the Christian State has only to deal with the members of Christ, whether suffering, sick or corrupt; it must pacify

national hatreds, mend the iniquities of society, and correct the vices of individuals. In it the foreigner has a right to citizenship, the slave a right to freedom, and the criminal a right to moral regeneration. In the city of God there is no enemy or foreigner, no slave or proletarian, no criminal or convict. The foreigner is simply a brother from a far country; the proletarian is an unfortunate brother who needs succor; the criminal is a fallen brother who must be helped up.

It follows that in the Christian State three things are absolutely ruled out: first, wars inspired by national selfishness, or conquests which build up one nation upon the ruins of another (for the prime objective of the Christian State is universal solidarity or the *pax Christiana);* next, civil and economic slavery which makes one class the passive instrument of another; and lastly, vindictive punishment, especially capital punishment, inflicted by society upon the guilty individual in order to make him a buttress of public safety. By committing a crime, the individual shows that he regards society simply as a means to, and his neighbors as the instrument of, his own selfishness. But this injustice must not be countered with the further injustice of belittling the criminal's own human divinity and of reducing him to the level of passive instrumentality by a punishment which leaves no room for his amendment or regeneration.

In the purely human order, the sphere of temporal relations, it was the duty of the State to give expression to that absolute solidarity of each individual with the whole universe which the Church represents in the spiritual order by the unity of her priesthood, her faith and her sacraments. Belief in this unity had to precede its realization in practice; before becoming Christian in fact, the State had to accept the Christian faith. This first step was taken at Constantinople; it sums up the whole Christian achievement of the Second Empire.

The Byzantine transformation of the Roman Empire, begun by Constantine the Great, continued by Theodosius and finally achieved by Justinian, produced no more than a nominally Christian state. Its laws, its institutions, and a good deal of its public morality, all retained unmistakable characteristics of the old paganism. Slavery continued to be legal; and crimes, especially political misdemeanors, were punished by law with an exquisite cruelty. This contrast between professed Christianity and practical savagery is aptly personified in the founder of the Second Empire; Constantine believed sincerely in the Christian God, paid honor to the bishops and discussed the Trinity with them; yet he had no scruple about exercising the right of a pagan husband and father, and putting Fausta and Crispus to death.

So glaring a contradiction between faith and life, however, could not last long without some attempt at reconciliation. Rather than sacrifice its actual paganism, the Byzantine Empire attempted in self-justification to pervert the purity of the Christian idea. This compromise between truth and error lies at the heart of all

those heresies (often devised by the imperial power and always, except in certain individual instances, favored by it) which distracted Christendom from the fourth century to the ninth.

The fundamental truth and distinctive idea of Christianity is the perfect union of the divine and the human individually achieved in Christ, and finding its social realization in Christian humanity, in which the divine is represented by the Church, centered in the supreme pontiff, and the human by the State. This intimate relation between Church and State implies the primacy of the former, since the divine is previous in time and superior in being to the human. Heresy attacked the perfect unity of the divine and the human in Jesus Christ precisely in order to undermine the living bond between Church and State, and to confer upon the latter an absolute independence. Hence it is clear why the emperors of the Second Rome, intent on maintaining within Christendom the absolutism of the pagan State, were so partial to all the heresies, which were but manifold variations on a single theme: —

Jesus Christ is not the true Son of God, consubstantial with the Father; God has not become incarnate; nature and mankind remain cut off from divinity, and are not united to it; and consequently the human State may rightly keep its independence and supremacy intact. Constantius and Valens had indeed good reason to support Ariamsm.

The humanity of Jesus Christ constitutes a person complete in itself, and is united only by a relationship to the Word of God. From which follows the practical conclusion that the human State is a complete and absolute entity, acknowledging no more than an external relationship to religion. This is the essence of the Nestorian heresy, and it becomes clear why on its appearance the Emperor Theodosius II took it under his protection and did all he could to uphold it.

The humanity in Jesus Christ is absorbed by His divinity: here is a heresy apparently the exact opposite of the preceding. Nothing of the sort; if the premise is different, the conclusion is exactly the same. If Christ's human nature exists no longer, the Incarnation is simply a past event, nature and humankind remain utterly outside the sphere of the Divine. Christ has borne away to Heaven all that was His and has abandoned the Earth to Cæsar. It was an unerring instinct which moved the same Theodosius, regardless of the apparent inconsistency, to transfer his favor from vanquished Nestorianism to the new-born Monophysitism, and to bring about its formal adoption by a quasi-œcumenical council, the "robber-council" of Ephesus. And even after the authority of a great Pope had prevailed over that of a heretical council, the emperors, more or less abetted by the Greek hierarchy, did not cease to attempt fresh compromises. The *henoticon* of the Emperor Zeno (which caused the first prolonged rupture between East and West, the schism of Acacius) and the unprincipled intrigues of Justinian and Theodora were followed by a new imperial heresy; Monothelitism maintained that there is no human will or

activity in the God-Man, that His human nature is purely passive, entirely controlled by the absolute fact of His divinity. This was, in effect, to deny human freedom and energy; it was that fatalism or quietism which would give human nature no share in the working out of its own salvation; for it is God alone Who operates, and the whole duty of the Christian consists in passive submission to the divine fact which is represented in its spiritual aspect by the unchanging Church and in its temporal aspect by the sacred power of the god Cæsar. Maintained for more than fifty years by the Empire and the whole Eastern hierarchy with the exception of a few monks who had to seek refuge at Rome, the Monothelite heresy was condemned at Constantinople in 680, only to make room before long for a new imperial compromise between Christian truth and the spirit of Antichrist.

The intimate union of the Creator and the creature is not confined in Christian belief to the rational being of Man; it includes also his corporeal being and, through the latter, the material nature of the whole universe. The compromise of the heretics tried in vain to abstract in principle from the divine-human unity, first, the very *substance* of Man's being, at one time by declaring it absolutely separate from the Divinity (in Nestorianism), at another by making it vanish completely into the latter (in Monophysitism); secondly, it tried to abstract human will and activity, the *rational being* of Man, by absorbing it into the divine operation (in Monothelitism); there only remained, thirdly, the *corporeal nature,* the external being of Man and, through him, of the whole of Nature. The denial to the material and sensible world of all possibility of redemption, sanctification and union with God; that is the idea at the root of the Iconoclastic heresy.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ in the flesh has proved that bodily existence is not excluded from the union of the human and the Divine, and that external and sensible objectivity can and must become the real instrument and visible image of the divine power. Hence the cult of holy images and relics, hence the legitimate belief in material miracles wrought by these sacred objects. Thus in declaring war on the images the Byzantine Emperors were not attacking a religious custom or a mere detail of worship so much as a necessary and infinitely important application of Christian truth itself. To claim that divinity cannot be sensibly expressed or externally manifested, or that the divine power cannot employ visible and symbolic means of action, is to rob the divine incarnation of all its reality. It was more than a compromise; it was the suppression of Christianity. Just as in the previous heresies under the semblance of a purely theological dispute there lay hidden a grave social and political issue, so the Iconoclastic movement under the guise of a ritual reformation threatened to shatter the social organism of Christendom. The material realization of the Divine, signified in the sphere of religious worship by holy images and relics, is represented in the social sphere by an institution. There is in the Christian Church a materially fixed point, an external and visible center of

action, an image and an instrument of the divine power. The apostolic see of Rome, that miraculous ikon of universal Christianity, was directly involved in the Iconoclastic struggle, since all the heresies were in the last resort denials of the reality of that divine incarnation, the permanence of which in the social and political order was represented by Rome. It is indeed historically evident that all the heresies actively supported or passively accepted by the majority of the Greek clergy encountered insuperable opposition from the Roman Church and finally came to grief on this Rock of the Gospel. This is especially true of the Iconoclastic heresy; for in denying all external manifestation of the divine in the world it was making a direct attack on the *raison d'être* of the Chair of Peter as the real objective center of the visible Church.

The pseudo-Christian Empire of Byzantium was bound to engage in decisive combat with the orthodox Papacy; for the latter was not only the infallible guardian of Christian truth but also the first realization of that truth in the collective life of the human race. To read the moving letters of Pope Gregory II to the barbarous Isaurian Emperor is to realize that the very existence of Christianity was at stake. The outcome of the struggle could not be in doubt; the last of the imperial heresies went the way of its predecessors, and with it the circle of theoretic or dogmatic compromises which Constantine's successors had attempted between Christian truth and the principle of paganism was finally closed. The era of imperial heresies was followed by the emergence of Byzantine "orthodoxy." To understand this fresh phase of the anti-Christian spirit we must revert to its origins in the preceding period.

Throughout the history of the great Eastern heresies, extending over five centuries from the time of Arius to that of the last Iconoclasts, we constantly find in the Empire and Church of the East three main parties whose alternating victories and defeats form the framework of this curious evolution. We see in the first place the champions of formal heresy, regularly instigated and supported by the imperial court. From the religious point of view, they represented the reaction of Eastern paganism to Christian truth; politically, they were the declared enemies of that independent ecclesiastical government founded by Jesus Christ and represented by the apostolic see of Rome. They began by conceding to sar, whose protégés they were, unbounded authority not only in the government of the Church but even in matters of doctrine; and when Cæsar, impelled by the orthodox majority of his subjects and by the fear of playing into the hands of the Pope, ended by betraying his own creatures, the leaders of the heretical party sought more solid support elsewhere by exploiting the separatist and semi-pagan tendencies of the various nations which were free, or were aiming at freedom, from the Roman yoke. Thus Arianism, the religion of the Empire under Constantius and Valens, but abandoned by their successors, claimed the allegiance of the Goths and Lombards for

centuries; Nestorianism, betrayed by its champion Theodosius II, was for a time welcomed by the Eastern Syrians; and Monophysitism, thrust out from Byzantium in spite of all the efforts of the Emperors, finally became the national religion of Egypt, Abyssinia and Armenia.

At the opposite extreme to this heretical party, trebly anti-Christian — in its religious doctrine, its secularism, and its nationalism — we find the absolutely orthodox Catholic party engaged in defending the purity of the Christian idea against all the pagan compromises and in championing free and worldwide ecclesiastical government against the onslaughts of Cæsaropapism and the aims of national separatism. This party could not count on the favor of earthly powers; of the higher clergy it included only individuals here and there. But it relied on the greatest religious force of those times, the monks, and also on the simple faith of the mass of devout believers, at least in the central parts of the Byzantine Empire. Moreover, these orthodox Catholics found and recognized in the central Chair of St. Peter the mighty palladium of religious truth and freedom. To indicate the moral weight and ecclesiastical importance of this party, it is enough to say that it was the party of St. Athanasius the Great, of St. John Chrysostom, of St. Flavian, of St. Maximus the Confessor and of St. Theodore of the Studium.

But it was neither the declared heretics nor the genuinely orthodox who controlled for many centuries the destinies of the Christian East. The decisive part in the story was played by a third party which, although it occupied an intermediate position between the other two, was distinguished from them by more than mere verbal subtleties; it had a clearly defined aim and pursued a well-considered policy. The great majority of the higher Greek clergy belonged to this party, which we may call semi-orthodox or rather “orthodox-anticatholic.” These priests held firmly to orthodox dogma, either from theoretical conviction or from force of habit or from devotion to the common tradition. They had nothing in principle against the unity of the universal Church, provided only that the center of that unity was situated in their midst; and since in point of fact this center was situated elsewhere, they preferred to be Greeks rather than Christians and accepted a divided Church rather than the Church unified by a power which was in their eyes foreign and hostile to their nationality. As Christians, they could not be Cæsaropapists in principle, but as patriotic Greeks first and foremost, they preferred the Byzantine Cæsaropapism to the Roman Papacy.

Unluckily for them the Greek autocrats distinguished themselves for the most part as the champions or even as the authors of heresy; and what they found still more intolerable was that the rare occasions when the Emperors took orthodoxy under their protection were exactly the occasions when the Empire and the Papacy were in accord with one another. To disturb this accord and to attach the Emperors to orthodoxy while weaning them from Catholicism was the chief aim of the Greek

hierarchy. In pursuit of this aim they were ready, despite their sincere orthodoxy, to make sacrifices even on questions of dogma.

Formal and explicit heresy was regarded with horror by these pious gentlemen, but when it pleased the divine Cæsar to offer them his own version of orthodox dogma, they did not scrutinize it too closely. They preferred to receive a revised or incomplete formula at the hands of a Greek Emperor rather than accept the truth pure and intact from the mouth of a Pope; they were glad to see Zeno's *henoticon* replace the dogmatic epistle of St. Leo the Great. In the six or seven successive episodes in the history of the Eastern heresies, the policy of the pseudo-orthodox party was always the same. When heresy in its first flush of victory was being thrust upon them with violence, these prudent people, having a pronounced distaste for martyrdom, gave way, though unwillingly. Thanks to their passive support, the heretics were able to convene general assemblies as large as, or even larger than, the true œcumenical councils. But when the blood of confessors, the fidelity of the mass of the people, and the threatening authority of the Roman pontiff had compelled the imperial power to forsake the cause of error, these unwilling heretics returned *en masse* to orthodoxy and, like the laborers hired at the eleventh hour, received their full pay. The heroic confessors seldom survived the persecutions, and it was the worldly-wise who enjoyed the victory of Truth. They formed the majority in the orthodox councils, as they had previously in the heretical conventions; and though they could not refuse concurrence to the Pope's representatives when he sent them a precise and definite formulation of orthodox dogma, though at the first they even expressed their concurrence with more or less sincere enthusiasm, the evident triumph of the Papacy soon brought them back to their prevailing sentiment of jealous hatred toward the apostolic see, and they proceeded to use all the efforts of a determined will and all the resources of an astute intelligence to counterbalance the success of the Papacy, to rob it of its rightful influence and to set up in opposition to it an unreal and usurped authority. The Pope had been useful in dealing with heresy; but once heresy was done with, what need was there of the Pope? Could not the patriarch of the old Rome be replaced by the patriarch of the new? Thus each triumph of orthodoxy, which was always the triumph of the Papacy, was invariably followed at Byzantium by an anti-Catholic reaction into which the sincere but short-sighted champions of orthodoxy were also drawn. This separatist reaction would last until a new heresy, more or less favored by the imperial power, supervened to disturb orthodox consciences and remind them of the advantage of a genuine ecclesiastical authority.

When official Arianism, having reigned supreme in the Eastern Empire for half a century, failed in the attempt to invade the Western Church, and a Spaniard came to Constantinople with the blessing of the Roman and Milanese pontiffs to restore

orthodoxy there, the decisive part played by the Papacy in the great struggle and in the final triumph of the true doctrine of the Trinity did not fail to arouse the jealousy of those prudent members of the Greek hierarchy who, having been semi-Arians under Constantius and Valens, had now become completely orthodox under Theodosius. Gathered in the year 380 in an assembly which a great saint of the period, Gregory the Theologian, has described in familiar words, they constituted themselves an œcumenical council without more ado, as though the whole of Western Christendom did not exist; they wantonly replaced the Nicene profession of faith, the common standard of universal orthodoxy in East and West, with a new formula of purely Eastern origin, and they crowned their uncanonical proceedings by conferring on the bishop of Constantinople, a mere suffragan of the archbishop of Heraclea, the dignity of first Patriarch of the Eastern Church, in despite of the apostolic sees of Alexandria and Antioch which the great Nicene council had confirmed in their rights. If the sovereign pontiffs had been ordinarily as ambitious as some like to represent them, if, indeed, the defense of their lawful rights had been dearer to their hearts than the preservation of universal peace, nothing could have prevented the separation of the two Churches in the year 381. But the generosity and Christian spirit of Pope Damasus succeeded in averting that disaster. He recognized that the creed of Constantinople was as orthodox as that of Nicæa and that the additional article on the Holy Spirit was justified in view of the new heresy of the Pneumatomachi, who held the Third Person of the Trinity to be a creature begotten by the Son and thus denied the procession of the Spirit from the Father. The Pope therefore approved the dogmatic act of the Greek council in his own name and in that of the whole Latin Church and thereby gave it the authority of a true œcumenical council; the usurpation of the patriarchate by the see of Constantinople was ignored.

But the Papacy played an even greater part in the history of the chief Christological heresies during the fifth century than in the Arian struggles of the fourth. Most of the Greek bishops, forming our third party, were shamefully compromised by their passive acquiescence in the robber-council of Ephesus at which the great body of orthodox prelates were obliged not only to see St. Flavian done to death before their eyes, but also to sign an heretical profession of faith. In contrast to this criminal weakness, the Papacy appeared in all its moral power and majesty in the person of St. Leo the Great. At Chalcedon the great number of Greek bishops who had taken part in Dioscorus' robber-council were obliged to beg forgiveness of the legates of Pope Leo, who was hailed as the divinely inspired head of the Universal Church. Such homage to justice and truth was too much for the moral mediocrity of these corrupt prelates. The anti-Catholic reaction followed immediately at the very same council. After enthusiastically applauding the Pope's dogmatic epistle as "the very words of the blessed apostle Peter," the Byzantine

bishops attempted to substitute for this apostolic utterance an ambiguous formula which left the door open to heresy.[1] Foiled in this attempt, they chose a different ground for their anti-Catholic activities, and in an irregular session of the council they asserted the imperial patriarch's primacy of jurisdiction over the whole East, and his equality with the Pope. This act, aimed against the sovereign pontiff, had nevertheless to be humbly submitted by the Greeks for the ratification of the Pope himself, who quashed it completely. Thus, in spite of all, the council of Chalcedon has its place in history as an outstanding triumph for the Papacy. But the orthodox anti-Catholics could not rest content with such an outcome, and this time the reaction was decisive and persistent. Pure orthodoxy being too Roman for them, they began to flirt with heresy. The patriarch Acacius favored the Emperor Zeno's *henoticon,* which was a compromise with Monophysitism; he was excommunicated by the Pope and has the unhappy distinction of giving his name to the first formal schism between East and West. But the main circumstances of this anti-Catholic reaction prevented its development into a definite cleavage. In the schism of Acacius the semi-orthodox party were discredited by the concessions they had to make to undisguised heresy, concessions which not only did violence to the religious convictions of the faithful, but did nothing to meet the demands of the heretics. The latter, emboldened by the *henoticon* which they had rejected with contempt, proceeded to set the whole of Egypt ablaze and threatened to separate it from the Empire. On the other side, the orthodox monks, exasperated by the treachery of the prelates, were stirring up discord in Syria and Asia Minor; and even in Constantinople itself the monk who pinned the bull of excommunication issued by the Pope on to the cope of the schismatic patriarch was applauded by the crowd.

To prolong such a state of affairs was not good policy; and urged by the imperial government, the successors of Acacius showed themselves more and more conciliatory. At length, under the Emperor Justin I, peace was concluded between the Churches to the advantage and honor of the Papacy. The Eastern bishops, in order to prove their orthodoxy and gain admission to the communion of the Roman Church, were obliged to accept and sign without reservation the dogmatic formula of Pope Hormisdas, that is, to recognize implicitly the supreme doctrinal authority of the apostolic see.[2] But the submission of the Greek prelates was not sincere; they were still meditating an entente with the Monophysites against the see of Peter. Despite their underhand intrigues, however, the power of the Papacy was demonstrated afresh — as the liturgical books of the Greco-Russian Church record

[1] This melancholy episode is somewhat glazed over in the acts of the council, but it stands out quite clearly in the account of the Church historian Evagrius.

[2] John, the patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to the Pope: "Prima salus est quia in sede apostolica inviolabilis semper catholica custoditur reigio' (Labbe, *Concil.* viii. 451, 2).

— when Pope St. Agapitus, who had come to Constantinople on a political mission, deposed on his own personal authority a patriarch suspected of Monophysitism, set up an orthodox patriarch in his stead, and compelled all the Greek bishops to sign anew the formula of Hormisdas.

Meanwhile, Justinian's forces were victorious in Africa and Italy; Rome was recovered from the Ostrogoths and the Pope was once again *de facto* the subject of the Byzantine Emperor. In these circumstances and under the influence of his wife's Monophysite tendencies, Justinian changed his attitude to the head of the Church. The anti-Catholic party seized the reins and Pope Vigilius, a prisoner at Constantinople, was fated to bear the brunt of a triumphant reaction. The supreme Teacher of the Church maintained his own orthodoxy, but as sovereign Head of the government of the Church he found himself deeply humiliated; and soon afterwards a bishop of Constantinople thought himself powerful enough to usurp the title of Œcumenical Patriarch.

This bishop, orthodox in his doctrine and an exemplary ascetic in his private life, fulfilled the ideal of the great anti-Catholic party. But a new imperial whim was sufficient to dispel the illusion of this precarious orthodoxy. The Emperor Heraclius thought he saw in Monothelitism the means of reuniting the orthodox with the moderate Monophysites and thus restoring peace to the Empire, consolidating the Greek religion and freeing it once for all from the influence of Rome. The higher clergy throughout the East welcomed this idea unreservedly. The patriarchal sees were occupied intermittently by a series of more or less fanatical heretics, and Monothelitism became for half a century the official religion of the whole Greek Empire as Semi-Arianism had been in the time of Constantius. A few monks, the heroic champions of orthodoxy, headed by St. Maximus the Confessor, took refuge at Rome; and once again the apostle Peter strengthened his brethren.

A long succession of Popes from Severinus to St. Agatho met the heresies of the Emperors with an unflinching opposition and one of them, St. Martin, was dragged by soldiers from the altar, was haled like a criminal from Rome to Constantinople and from Constantinople to the Crimea, and finally gave his life for the orthodox faith. At length, after fifty years' struggle, religious truth and moral power won the day. The mighty Empire and its worldly clergy surrendered once again to a poor, defenseless pontiff.

At the council of Constantinople, the sixth œcumenical council, the apostolic see of Rome was honored as an authority that had remained untainted by error; and the Greek bishops received Pope Agatho's pronouncement with a repetition of the acclamations with which the fathers of Chalcedon had formerly hailed St. Leo the Great. But once again it was not long before this momentary enthusiasm was followed by a powerful reaction. While the true heroes of orthodoxy, such as St.

Maximus the Confessor, could not find words strong enough to extol the pre-eminence and achievements of the Roman see, the orthodox anti-Catholics, though profiting by its achievements, were too jealous of its pre-eminence to give it recognition. In their humiliation and irritation at the long list of heretics and heresiarchs who had defiled the see of Constantinople and whom the council was bound to anathematize, the Greek bishops revenged themselves by inventing the heresy of Pope Honorius and foisting it upon the good-natured Roman legates. Not content with this, they re-assembled some years after the council in the imperial palace at Constantinople *(in Trullo);* for this convention they claimed œcumenical authority on various absurd pretexts either by representing it, contrary to the evidence, as the continuation of the sixth council, or alternatively — such is the usual duplicity of falsehood — by reckoning it as the conclusion of the fifth and sixth councils under the outlandish title of "Quinisext." The object of these absurd deceptions came out clearly in certain canons promulgated by the fathers of the Trullan council, which condemned various disciplinary and ritual usages of the Roman Church. There, ready-made, were the grounds for schism; and if schism did not follow then and there, two centuries before Photius, we have only to thank the Iconoclast Emperor, Leo the Isaurian, who at that moment came on the scene to upset the well-laid plans of the orthodox anti-Catholics.

Here was the most violent, as it was the last, of the imperial heresies; and with its emergence all the indirect and disguised denials of the Christian idea were exhausted. After the condemnation of the Iconoclasts, the fundamental dogma of Christian orthodoxy — the perfect union of the Creator and the creature — was defined in all its aspects and became an accepted fact. But the seventh œcumenica1 council which achieved this task in 787 had been assembled under the auspices of Pope Adrian I and had taken a dogmatic epistle of that pontiff as guide to its decisions. It was again a triumph for the Papacy; it could not then be "the triumph of Orthodoxy;" that was postponed till half a century later when, after the comparatively feeble Iconoclastic reaction brought about by the Armenian dynasty, the orthodox anti-Catholic party finally succeeded in 842 in crushing the last remnants of the imperial heresy without the help of the Pope, and in including it with all the others under a solemn anathema.[1] Indeed, Byzantine orthodoxy might well triumph in 842; the great Photius, its light and glory, was already making his appearance at the court of the devout Theodora, the Empress who caused the massacre of a hundred thousand Paulician heretics; before long he would be mounting the throne of the œcumenical patriarchs.

[1] The memory of this event is perpetuated by a feast bearing the title "The Triumph of Orthodoxy," on which the anathema of the year 842 is repeated.

The schism initiated by Photius in 867 and consummated by Michael Cerularius in 1054 was closely connected with the "Triumph of Orthodoxy" and was the complete realization of the ideal which the orthodox anti-Catholic party had dreamed of since the fourth century. Dogmatic truth having been once defined and all the heresies finally condemned, they had no further use for the Pope; nothing remained but to crown the work by a formal separation from Rome. Furthermore, it was this solution which best suited the Byzantine Emperors; for they had come to see that it was not worthwhile rousing the religious passions of their subjects by doctrinal compromise between Christianity and paganism and thus throwing them into the arms of the Papacy, when a strict theoretical orthodoxy could very well be reconciled with a political and social order which was completely pagan. It is a significant fact, and one that has not been sufficiently observed, that from the year 842 not a single imperial heretic or heresiarch reigned at Constantinople, and the harmony between the Greek Church and State was not once seriously disturbed. The two powers had come to terms and had made their peace, bound to one another by a common idea: the denial of Christianity as a social force and as the motive principle of historical progress. The Emperors permanently embraced "Orthodoxy" as an abstract dogma, while the orthodox prelates bestowed their benediction *in sæcula sæculorum* on the paganism of Byzantine public life. And since "sine sanguine nullum pactum," a magnificent hecatomb of one hundred thousand Paulicians sealed the alliance of the Second Rome with the "Second Church."

This so-called "orthodoxy" of the Byzantines was in fact nothing but ingrown heresy. The true central dogma of Christianity is the intimate and complete union of the Divine and the human without confusion or division. The logical consequence of this truth — to confine ourselves to the sphere of practical human existence — is the regeneration of social and political life by the spirit of the Gospel, in other words, the Christianization of society and the State. Instead of this synthetic and organic union of the Divine and the human, the two elements were in turn confused or divided, or one of them was absorbed or suppressed by the other. To begin with, the Divine and the human were confused in the sacred majesty of the Emperor. Just as in the confused thought of the Arians Christ was a hybrid being, more than man and less than God, so Cæsaropapism, which was simply political Arianism, confused the temporal and spiritual powers without uniting them, and made the autocrat something more than the head of the State, without succeeding in making him a true head of the Church. Religious society was separated from secular society, the former being relegated to the monasteries, while the forum was abandoned to pagan laws and passions. The dualism of Nestorius, condemned in theology, became the very foundation of Byzantine life. Or again, the religious ideal was reduced to bare contemplation, that is, to the

absorption of the human spirit in the Godhead, an obviously Monophysite ideal. The moral life, on the other hand, was robbed of its practical force by the inculcation of the supreme ideal of passive obedience and blind submission to power; that is to say, of an ideal of quietism which was in reality the denial of human will and energy, the heresy of the Monothelites. Finally, an exaggerated asceticism attempted to suppress the bodily nature of man and to shatter the living image of the divine incarnation — a logical though unconscious application of the Iconoclastic heresy.

This profound contradiction between professed orthodoxy and practical heresy was the Achilles' heel of the Byzantine Empire. There lay the real cause of its downfall. Indeed, it deserved to fall and still more it deserved to fall before Islam. For Islam is simply sincere and logical Byzantinism, free from all its inner contradiction. It is the frank and full reaction of the spirit of the East against Christianity; it is a system in which dogma is closely related to the conditions of life and in which the belief of the individual is in perfect agreement with the social and political order.

We have seen that the anti-Christian movement, which found expression in the imperial heresies, had in the seventh and eighth centuries issued in two doctrines, of which one, that of the Monothelites, was an indirect denial of human freedom, and the other, that of the Iconoclasts, was an implied rejection of the divine phenomenality. The direct and explicit assertion of these two errors was of the essence of the Moslem religion. Islam sees in Man a finite form without freedom, and in God an infinite freedom without form. God and Man being thus fixed at the two opposite poles of existence, there can be no filial relationship between them; the notion of the Divine coming down and taking form, or of the human ascending to a spiritual existence, is excluded; and religion is reduced to a mere external relation between the all-powerful Creator and the creature which is deprived of all freedom and owes its master nothing but a bare act of "blind surrender" (for this is what the Arabic word *islam* signifies). This act of surrender, expressed in a short formula of prayer to be invariably repeated day by day at fixed hours, sums up the whole religious background of the Eastern mind, which spoke its last word by the mouth of Mohammed. The simplicity of this idea of religion is matched by a no less simple conception of the social and political problem: Man and the human race have no real progress to make; there is no moral regeneration for the individual and therefore *a fortiori* none for society; everything is brought down to the level of a purely natural existence; the ideal is reduced to the point at which its realization presents no difficulties. Moslem society could have no other aim but the expansion of its material power and the enjoyment of the good things of the Earth. The spread of Islam by force of arms, and the government of the faithful with absolute authority, and according to the rules of an elementary justice laid down in the

Koran — such is the whole task of the Moslem state, a task which it would be difficult not to accomplish with success. Despite the tendency to verbal falsehood innate in all Orientals as individuals, the complete correspondence between its beliefs and its institutions gives to the whole of Mohammedan society a distinctive note of truth and sincerity which the Christian world has never been able to achieve. Christendom as a whole is certainly set upon the path of progress and transformation; and the very loftiness of its ideal forbids us to judge it finally by any one of its various phases, past or present. But Byzantinism, which was hostile in principle to Christian progress and which aimed at reducing the whole of religion to a fact of past history, a dogmatic formula, and a liturgical ceremonial — this anti-Christianity, concealed beneath the mask of orthodoxy, was bound to collapse in moral impotence before the open and sincere anti-Christianity of Islam. It is interesting to observe that the new religion, with its dogma of fatalism, made its appearance at the precise moment when the Emperor Heraclius was inventing the Monothelite heresy, which was the disguised denial of human freedom and energy. It was hoped by this device to strengthen the official religion and to restore Egypt and Asia to the unity of the Empire. But Egypt and Asia preferred the Arab declaration of faith to the political expedient of Byzantium. Nothing would be more astonishing than the ease and swiftness of the Moslem conquest were no account taken of the prolonged anti-Christian policy of the Second Empire. Five years were enough to reduce three great patriarchates of the Eastern Church to the condition of historical relics. It was not a matter of conversion but simply of tearing off the mask.

History has passed judgment upon the Second Empire and has condemned it. Not only did it fail in its appointed task of founding the Christian State, but it strove to make abortive the historic work of Jesus Christ. Having attempted in vain to pervert orthodox dogma, it reduced it to a dead letter; it sought to undermine the edifice of the *pax Christiana* by attacking the central government of the Universal Church; and in public life it supplanted the law of the Gospel by the traditional policy of the pagan State. The Byzantines believed that true Christianity meant no more than guarding the dogmas and sacred rites of orthodoxy without troubling to Christianize social and political life; they thought it lawful and laudable to confine Christianity to the temple while they abandoned the marketplace to the principles of paganism. They had no reason to complain of the result; they were given their wish. Their dogma and their ritual were left to them; it was only the social and political power that fell into the hands of the Moslems, the rightful heirs of paganism.

The vocation to found the Christian State which the Greek Empire thus refused was transferred to the Romano-German world of the Franks and Allemanni. It was transferred to them by the only Christian power that had the right and duty to do

so, by the power of St. Peter, the holder of the keys of the Kingdom. Observe the coincidence of dates. The foundation-stone of the future Empire of the West was laid by the baptism and anointing of the Frankish king Clovis in 496, just when, after several fruitless attempts at agreement, it seemed that the schism of Acacius would mean the final severance of the whole of Eastern Christendom from the Catholic Church. The coincidence of the year 754 is even more remarkable; at the very moment when, with every appearance of œcumenical authority, a great Iconoclastic council at Constantinople was approving the last and most violent of the imperial heresies, directed especially against the Roman Church, Pope Stephen was anointing the father of Charlemagne at Reims — or was it at St. Denis? Who will say? — with these words: “Quia ideo vos Dominus per humilitatem meam mediante S. Petro unxit in reges ut per vos sua sancta exaltatur Ecclesia et princeps apostolorum suam recipiat justitiam.” The Carolingian dynasty was bound to the Papacy by a direct filial relationship. The Pope, says an old chronicle, “per auctoritatem apostolicam jussit Pippinum regem fieri.” This act, together with its inevitable consequences, the conquest of Italy by the Franks, the donation of Pepin, and the crowning of Charlemagne as Roman Emperor, was the real and immediate cause of the separation of the Churches. By transferring the imperial scepter to a Western barbarian, the Pope became doubly a foreigner and a foe to the Greeks. All that was needed to rob him of any support at Constantinople was that the Emperors should once for all renounce their heretical tendencies, and the union of all the “Orthodox” under the standard of anti-Catholicism would be complete. The event was not long delayed; the “Triumph of Orthodoxy” and the schism of Photius were the answer of Byzantium to the crowning of Charlemagne.

This was no matter of a dispute in theology or of a rivalry between prelates. It was simply the refusal of the old Empire of Constantine to give place to the new Western power born of the close alliance of the Papacy with the Frankish kingdom; everything else was secondary or by way of excuse. This view of the matter is confirmed by the fact that after Photius’ death the schism took no effect for a century and a half — exactly the period when Western Christendom, newly organized, seemed on the verge of collapse, when the Papacy was subservient to a degenerate oligarchy and had lost its moral and religious prestige, and when the Carolingian dynasty was consumed with internal strife. But no sooner was the imperial power restored under the energetic government of the German kings, no sooner was the see of St. Peter again occupied by men of apostolic character, than the anti-Catholic movement at Constantinople broke forth with violence and the schism was consummated.

The Franco-German Empire made sincere attempts to fulfil the task imposed upon it by its dignity as a Christian state. Notwithstanding its vices and its disorders, the new society of the West possessed one enormous advantage over the

Byzantine Empire, namely the consciousness of its own evils and a profound desire to be rid of them; witness the innumerable councils summoned by popes, emperors and kings to effect moral reforms in the Church and to bring the condition of society nearer to the Christian ideal. These reforms were, indeed, never fully successful, but the point is that they did occupy men's minds and that there was a refusal to accept in principle a contradiction between truth and life after the manner of the Byzantine world, which had never been concerned to harmonize its social conditions with its faith and had never undertaken any moral reformation; its councils had only been interested in dogmatic formu1æ and in the claims of its hierarchy.

But in giving Charlemagne and Otto the Great, St. Henry and St. Louis their due, we are bound to confess that, taken all in all, the medieval monarchy (whether under the fictitious form of the Roman Empire or under the real form of a national dynasty) did not fulfil its mission as a Christian State, nor succeed in definitely modelling society on the Christian ideal. Those great sovereigns themselves were far from grasping the social and political problem of Christianity in all its bearings; and even their ideal, for all its imperfection, proved too exalted for their successors. It was the policy of the Emperor Henry IV and of King Philip the Fair, not that of their saintly predecessors, which formed the general rule; it was their policy that paved the way for the reformation of Luther and in time bore fruit in the French Revolution. The German Empire, brought to the birth by the Roman See, broke the bonds of its parentage and set itself up as the rival of the Papacy. Thus was taken the first and most momentous step on the path of revolution. Such rivalry between father and son could not form the organic basis of a social order. The German Empire, by exhausting its strength in an anti-Christian struggle lasting through two centuries and by attacking the very basis of Catholic unity, forfeited not only its supremacy among the nations, but its very right to that supremacy. Disregarding this fictitious Roman Empire, the states of Europe proceeded to constitute themselves complete and absolutely independent units; and once again it fell to the Papacy, while warding off the attacks of the German Empire, to assume the great task which that Empire was unworthy and unable to discharge.

It is not our present concern to praise or to justify the historical achievement of a Hildebrand or an Innocent III. Among historians of the present generation, they have received not only vindication but encomium from such distinguished Protestant writers as Voigt, Hurter and Neander. In what the great medieval popes achieved (beyond the purely spiritual sphere) for the culture of the European peoples, the peace of nations and the good order of society, there is all the greater merit inasmuch as in this work they were fulfilling a function which did not properly belong to them. Zoology and medicine tell us of cases in which a young and vigorous organism, accidentally injured in one of its essential organs, transfers

its function for the time being to another organ in good condition, which is known as a “vicarious organ” *(organe vicariant, vikarirendes Organ).* The imperial papacy or papal empire of Innocent III and Innocent IV was such a “vicarious organ.” But this could not continue indefinitely. It needed men of exceptional quality to deal with the details of a vast and complicated political administration while keeping them all the while subordinate to the universal and spiritual goal. In succession to popes who had raised politics to the height of moral activity, there inevitably followed many more who degraded religion to the level of material interests. If Protestant historians have extolled the high achievements of the papal empire, its rapid decay is recorded by the greatest of Catholic writers, who in immortal lines calls upon a second Charlemagne to put an end to the fatal confusion of the two powers in the Roman Church (Dante, *Inferno,* xix; *Purgatorio,* vi, xvi).

Indeed, if we consider the political and social condition of Europe towards the close of the Middle Ages we must admit that the Papacy, robbed of its secular organ and obliged to combine the two functions, was unable to give to the society which it had governed a genuinely Christian organization. International unity — the *pax Christiana* — was nonexistent. The nations were given up to fratricidal wars, and only by a supernatural intervention was the national existence of France saved.

The social constitution of Europe, based on the relationship between victors and vanquished, always retained this anti-Christian character of inequality and oppression. The predominance in public life of a pride of blood which created an insurmountable barrier between noble and serf, and of a spirit of violence which made every country the scene of civil war and plunder, in addition to a penal code so barbarous as to seem diabolically inspired — where in all this can the features of a truly Christian society be recognized?

For lack of an imperial power genuinely Christian and Catholic, the Church has not succeeded in establishing social and political justice in Europe. The nations and states of modern times, freed since the Reformation from ecclesiastical surveillance, have attempted to improve upon the work of the Church. The results of the experiment are plain to see. The idea of Christendom as a real, though admittedly inadequate, unity embracing all the nations of Europe has vanished; the philosophy of the revolutionaries has made praiseworthy attempts to substitute for this unity the unity of the human race — with what success is well known. A universal militarism transforming whole nations into hostile armies and itself inspired by a national hatred such as the Middle Ages never knew; a deep and irreconcilable social conflict; a class struggle which threatens to whelm everything in fire and blood; and a continuous lessening of moral power in individuals, witnessed to by the constant increase in mental collapse, suicide and crime — such

is the sum total of the progress which secularized Europe has made in the last three or four centuries.[1]

The two great historic experiments, that of the Middle Ages and that of modern times, seem to demonstrate conclusively that neither the Church, lacking the assistance of a secular power which is distinct from but responsible to her, nor the secular State, relying upon its own resources, can succeed in establishing Christian justice and peace on the Earth. The close alliance and organic union of the two powers *without confusion and without division* is the indispensable condition of true social progress. It remains to enquire whether there is in the Christian world a power capable of taking up the work of Constantine and Charlemagne with better hope of success.

The profoundly religious and monarchic instinct of the Russian people, certain prophetic events in its past history, the enormous and compact bulk of its Empire, the great latent strength of the national spirit in contrast to the poverty and emptiness of its actual existence — all this seems to indicate that it is the historic destiny of Russia to provide the Universal Church with the political power which it requires for the salvation and regeneration of Europe and of the world.

Great tasks cannot be accomplished with small means. It is not a matter of religious compromise between two hierarchies, nor of diplomatic negotiations between two governments. It is primarily a moral and intellectual bond that must be forged between the religious conscience of Russia and the truth of the Universal Church; and in order to commend to our reason the truth of a principle of which the historical realization is foreign and even repugnant to us, we must seek the ultimate ground of this truth in the fundamental idea of Christianity.

In the first part of my work, the critical and controversial section, I have tried to show what Russia actually needs if she is to fulfil her theocratic mission; in the second I have expounded, in the light of theology and history, the basis of the universal unity established by Christ, the monarchical government of the Church; in the third I have set out to relate the idea of theocracy (the social Trinity) to the theosophic idea (the divine Trinity).[2]

---

[1] I am speaking here of the general result; that there has been progress in certain directions is unquestionable. We need only mention the mitigation of the severity of penal legislation and the abolition of torture. The gain is considerable, but can it be regarded as secure? If class war were to break out one day with all the fury of a long restrained hatred, we should witness remarkable happenings. Events of ill-omen, acts of Mezentian barbarity, have already taken place between Paris and Versailles in 1871.

[2] In order to support my argument I have been obliged in places to introduce a literal translation of certain passages of the Bible. I have thought it right to add the Hebrew text, not in order to parade my knowledge which is quite elementary, but to justify my rendering which might appear quaint and arbitrary. Since there is no absolutely binding rule for the transcription of Hebrew words into Latin characters, I have endeavored to suit my spelling to French pronunciation, while avoiding typographical complications. [In the present translation the author's transcription has been adapted to conform to the recognized English transcription of Hebrew.—Tr.]

This work is an abridgment of a larger work in the Russian language at which I have been working for seven years, but which has not been allowed to appear in my own country; the first volume, published in 1887 at Agram in Croatia, was banned by the Russian censorship. In these circumstances it seemed to me more practical to epitomize my work and address it to a wider public.[1] I firmly hope to see the day when my country will enjoy that blessing which is her primary need — religious freedom. But in the meantime I thought that I ought not to keep silence, and it seemed that to publish in French would be the most effectual means of making the truth heard.

In the two first parts of my work, I have suppressed or reduced to a minimum all those topics on which I could only repeat what has been better said by others. For details concerning the state of religion and of the Church in Russia, I am glad to be able to refer my readers to the third volume of M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu's well-known work, *L'Empire des Tsars.* The Western reader will also find useful and interesting information in the Rev. Fr. Tondini's book, *Le pape de Rome et les papes des Églises orientales.*

By way of bringing this too lengthy preface to an end, here is a parable which will perhaps bring out more clearly my general point of view and the purpose of the present work.

A great architect, setting out on a voyage to distant parts, called his pupils and said to them: "You know that I came here to rebuild the principal sanctuary of the country which had been destroyed by an earthquake. The work is begun; I have sketched the general plan, the site has been cleared and the foundations laid. You will take my place during my absence. I will certainly return, but I cannot tell you when. Work, therefore, as though you had to complete the task without me. Now is the time for you to apply the teaching that I have given you. I trust you, and I am not going to lay down all the details of the work. Only observe the rules of our art. I am leaving you the solid foundations of the Temple which I have laid and the general plan that I have traced; that will be sufficient if you are faithful to your duty. And I am not leaving you alone; in spirit and in thought, I will be always with you." With these words he led them to the site of the new church, showed them the foundations and handed them the plan.

After his departure, his pupils worked in complete harmony and almost a third of the building was soon raised. As the work was vast and extremely complicated, the first companions were not enough and new ones had to be admitted. It was not long before a serious dispute arose between those who were in charge of the work.

[1] We recall to our readers the pamphlet *L'Idée russe,* which for the same reasons M. Solovyev published in Paris in 1888. — Ed.

Some of them maintained that of the two things left them by their absent Master — the foundations of the building and its general plan — only the latter was important and indispensable; there was nothing, they said, to prevent them from abandoning the foundations already laid and building on another site. When their companions violently opposed this idea, they went further and in the heat of the argument actually declared (contrary to what they themselves had often maintained before) that the Master had never laid nor even indicated the foundations of the Temple; that was merely an invention of their opponents. Many of the latter, on the other hand, in their anxiety to maintain the importance of the foundations, went to the opposite extreme and declared that the only thing that really mattered in the whole work was the foundation of the building which the Master had laid, and that their proper task consisted simply in preserving, repairing and strengthening the already existing part of the building, without any idea of finishing it entirely, for (they said) the completion of the work was reserved exclusively for the Master himself at the time of his return. Extremes meet, and the two opposing parties soon found themselves agreed on one point, that the building was not to be completed. But the party which insisted on preserving the foundations and the unfinished nave in good condition plunged into various secondary activities for that purpose and displayed indefatigable energy, whereas the party which thought it possible to abandon the original foundation of the Temple declared, after vainly attempting to build on another site, that there was no need to do anything at all; the essential thing in the art of architecture, they maintained, was theory, the contemplation of its classic examples and meditation on its rules, not the carrying out of a definite design; if the Master had left them his plan of the Temple, it was certainly not with the object of getting them to work together on its actua1 construction, but simply in order that each one of them by studying this perfect plan might himself become an accomplished architect. Thereupon the most zealous of them devoted their lives to meditating on the design of the ideal Temple and learning and reciting by heart every day the explanations of that design which some of the early companions had worked out in accordance with the Master's instructions. But the majority were content to think of the Temple once a week, and the rest of the time was spent by each of them in attending to his own business.

There were, however, some of these dissentients who, from a study of the Master's plan and of his own original explanation of it, perceived clear indications that the foundations of the Temple had actually been laid and could never be changed; among other remarks of the great architect they came across the following: "Here are the impregnable foundations that I have laid myself; it is upon them that my Temple must be built if it is to be proof for ever against earthquake or any other destructive force." Impressed by these words, the good workers resolved to give up their quarrel and to lose no time in joining the guardians of the

foundations, in order to assist them in their work of preservation. There was, however, one worker who said: “Let us admit our mistake; let us be just and give due honor to our old associates; let us rejoin them around the great building which we began, but to our shame abandoned and which to their incalculable credit they have guarded and kept in good condition. But above all we must be faithful to the Master’s conception. He did not mean these foundations which he laid to remain untouched; he meant his Temple to be built upon them. Therefore we must all unite to complete the building upon the existing foundations. Shall we have time to finish it before the Master’s return, or not? That is a question which he did not see fit to answer. But he did tell us explicitly to do everything to continue his work; and, moreover, he added that we should do more than he had done.” This worker’s appeal seemed strange to most of his companions. Some called him an idealist, others accused him of pride and presumption. But the voice of conscience told him clearly that his absent Master was with him in spirit and in truth.

As a member of the true and venerable Eastern or Greco-Russian Orthodox Church which does not speak through an anti-canonical synod nor through the employees of the secular power, but through the utterance of her great Fathers and Doctors, I recognize as supreme judge in matters of religion him who has been recognized as such by St. Ireneus, St. Dionysius the Great, St. Athanasius the Great, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Flavian, the Blessed Theodoret, St. Maximus the Confessor, St. Theodore of the Studium, St. Ignatius, etc. etc. — namely, the Apostle Peter, who lives in his successors and who has not heard in vain our Lord’s words: “Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church;” “Strengthen thy brethren;” “Feed My sheep, feed My lambs.”

O deathless spirit of the blessed Apostle, invisible minister of the Lord in the government of His visible Church, thou knowest that she has need of an earthly body for her manifestation. Twice already hast thou embodied her in human society: in the Greco-Roman world, and again in the Romano-German world; thou hast made both the Empire of Constantine and the Empire of Charlemagne to serve her. After these two provisional incarnations, she awaits her third and last incarnation. A whole world full of energies and of yearnings, but with no clear consciousness of its destiny knocks at the door of universal history. What is your word, ye peoples of the word? The multitude knows it not yet, but powerful voices issuing from your midst have already disclosed it. Two centuries ago a Croatian priest announced it with prophetic tongue, and in our own days a bishop of the same nation has more than once proclaimed it with superb eloquence. The utterance of the spokesmen of the Western Slavs, the great Krishanitch, and the great Strossmayer, needs only a simple *Amen* from the Eastern Slavs. It is this

Amen that I come to speak in the name of a hundred million Russian Christians, in full and firm confidence that they will not repudiate me.

Your word, O peoples of the word, is free and universal Theocracy, the true solidarity of all nations and classes, the application of Christianity to public life, the Christianizing of politics; freedom for all the oppressed, protection for all the weak; social justice and good Christian peace. Open to them, therefore, thou Key-bearer of Christ, and may the gate of history be for them and for the whole world the gate of the Kingdom of God!

PART ONE

THE STATE OF RELIGION IN RUSSIA AND THE CHRISTIAN EAST

I

The Russian legend of St. Nicholas and St. Cassian.
Its application to the two separated Churches.

A POPULAR Russian legend tells how St. Nicolas and St. Cassian were once sent from Paradise upon a visit to the Earth. On their journey they met a poor peasant who had got his wagon, with a load of hay upon it, stuck deep in the mud and was making fruit1ess efforts to get his horses on.

"Let's go and give the good fellow a hand," said St. Nicolas.

"Not I; I'm keeping out of it," replied St. Cassian, "I don't want to get my coat dirty."

"Well, wait for me," said St. Nicolas, "or go on without me if you like," and plunging without hesitation into the mud, he vigorously assisted the peasant in dragging his wagon out of the rut.

When he had finished the job and caught his companion up, he was all covered in filth; his coat was torn and soiled and looked like a beggar's rags. St. Peter was amazed to see him arrive at the gate of Paradise in this condition.

"I say! Who ever got you into that state?" he asked.

St. Nicolas told his story.

"And what about you?" asked St. Peter, turning to St. Cassian. "Weren't you with him in this encounter?"

"Yes, but I don't meddle in things that are no concern of mine, and I was especially anxious not to get my beautiful clean coat dirty."

"Very well," said St. Peter, "You, St. Nicolas, because you were not afraid of getting dirty in helping your neighbor out of a difficulty, shall for the future have two feasts a year, and you shall be reckoned the greatest of saints after me by all the peasants of Holy Russia. And you, St. Cassian, must be content with having a nice clean coat; you shall have your feastday in leap-year only, once every four years."

We may well forgive St. Cassian for his dislike of manual labor and the mud of the highroad. But he would be quite wrong to condemn his companion for having a different idea of the duties of saints towards mankind. We may like St. Cassian's clean and spotless clothes, but since our wagon is still deep in the mud, St. Nicolas is the one we really need, the stout-hearted saint who is always ready to get to work and help us.

The Western Church, faithful to the apostolic mission, has not been afraid to plunge into the mire of history. After having been for centuries the only element of moral order and intellectual culture among the barbarous peoples of Europe, it undertook the task not only of the spiritual education of these peoples of independent spirit and uncivilized instincts, but also of their material government. In devoting itself to this arduous task, the Papacy, like St. Nicolas in the legend, thought not so much of the cleanliness of its own appearance as of the urgent needs of mankind. The Eastern Church, on the other hand, with its solitary asceticism and its contemplative mysticism, its withdrawal from political life and from all the social problems which concern mankind as a whole, thought chiefly, like St. Cassian, of reaching Paradise without a single stain on its clothing. The Western Church aimed at employing all its powers, divine and human, for the attainment of a universal goal; the Eastern Church was only concerned with the preservation of its purity. There is the chief point of difference and the fundamental cause of the schism between the two Churches.

It is a question of a different ideal of the religious life itself. The religious ideal of the separated Christian East is not false; it is incomplete. In Eastern Christendom for the last thousand years, religion has been identified with personal piety,[1] and prayer has been regarded as the one and only religious activity. The Western Church, without disparaging individual piety as the true germ of all religion, seeks the development of this germ and its blossoming into a social activity organized for the glory of God and the universal good of mankind. The Eastern prays, the Western prays and labors. Which of the two is right?

Jesus Christ founded His visible Church not merely to meditate on Heaven, but also to labor upon Earth and to withstand the gates of Hell. He did not send His apostles into the solitude of the desert, but into the world to conquer it and subject it to the Kingdom which is not of this world, and He enjoined upon them not only the innocence of doves, but also the wisdom of serpents. If it is merely a question of preserving the purity of the Christian soul, what is the purpose of all the Church's social organization and of all those sovereign and absolute powers with which Christ has armed her in giving her final authority to bind and to loose on Earth as well as in Heaven?

The monks of the holy mountain of Athos, true representatives of the isolated Eastern Church, have for centuries spent all their energies in prayer and the contemplation of the uncreated light of Tabor.[2] They are perfectly right; prayer and

---

[1] In old Russian the word "piety" *(blagochestie)* was ordinarily used to express "orthodoxy," and the expression "pious belief" *(blagochestivaya vera)* was used instead of "orthodox belief."

[2] By certain physiological or psychological processes which are summed up among us under the name of "cerebral action" (*umnoye delanie*) the hermits of Athos achieve a state of ecstasy in which they experience unique sensations and claim to see the divine light which manifested itself at the Transfiguration of our Lord. The curious thing is that this phenomenon is regarded as an eternal, subsistent reality. In the fourteenth century furious controversy arose in

the contemplation of uncreated things are essential to the Christian life. But can we allow that this occupation of the soul constitutes the *whole* Christian life? — for that is what we must do if we try to put the Orthodox East, with its peculiar character and special religious tendencies, in the place of the Universal Church. We have in the East a Church at prayer, but where among us is the Church in action, asserting itself as a spiritual force absolutely independent of the powers of this world? Where in the East is the Church of the living God, the Church which in every generation legislates for mankind, which establishes and develops the formulation of eternal truth with which to counteract the continually changing forms of error? Where is the Church which labors to re-mold the whole social life of the nations in accordance with the Christian ideal, and to guide them towards the supreme goal of Creation — free and perfect union with the Creator?

The advocates of an exclusive asceticism should remember that the perfect Man spent only forty days in the wilderness; those who contemplate the light of Tabor should not forget that that light appeared only once in the earthly life of Christ, Who proved by His own example that true prayer and true contemplation are simply a foundation for the life of action. If this great Church, which for centuries has done nothing but pray, has not prayed in vain, she must show herself a living Church, acting, struggling, victorious. But we ourselves must will that it be so. We must, above all, recognize the insufficiency of our traditional religious ideal, and make a sincere attempt to realize a more complete conception of Christianity. There is no need to invent or create anything new for this purpose. We merely have to restore to our religion its Catholic or universal character by recognizing our oneness with the active part of the Christian world, with the West centralized and organized for a universal activity and possessing all that we lack. We are not asked to change our nature as Easterns or to repudiate the specific character of our religious genius. We have only to recognize unreservedly the elementary truth that we of the East are but a part of the Universal Church, a part moreover which has not its center within itself, and that therefore it behooves us to restore the link between our individual forces upon the circumference and the great universal center which Providence has placed in the West. There is no question of suppressing our religious and moral individuality, but rather of crowning it and inspiring it with a universal and progressive life. The whole of our duty to ourselves consists simply in recognizing ourselves for what we are in reality, an organic part of the great body of Christendom, and in affirming our spiritual solidarity with our Western brethren. This moral act of justice and charity would

---

the Greek Church over the inquiry into the real nature of the light of Tabor and its relation to the essence of the Godhead.

be in itself an immense step forward on our part and the essential condition of all further advance.

St. Cassian need not become a different person or cease to care about keeping his clothes spotless. He must simply recognize that his comrade has certain important qualities which he himself lacks, and instead of sulking at this energetic worker he must frankly accept him as his companion and guide on the earthly voyage that still lies before them.

II

The question of the raison d'être *of Russia.*

BUT at this point I am interrupted by the familiar cry of my countrymen. "Let no one speak to us of our needs, of our shortcomings, least of all of our duties towards the decadent West! It has had its day! We have no need of it and no obligation towards it. We have in the East everything that we need. *In* (sic) *Oriente lux.*[1] The true representative and crowning achievement of Christianity is Holy Russia. What have we to do with the old Rome in her decay, when we are ourselves the Rome of the future, the third and last Rome? [2] The Eastern Church has fulfilled her great historic task in Christianizing the Russian people, that people which has identified itself with Christianity and to which belongs the whole future of mankind." This view would reduce the ultimate historical objective of Christianity and the *raison d'être* of the human race to the existence of a single nation. But to accept such an assertion would involve the formal denial of the very notion of a Universal Church. It implies a reversion to ancient Judaism, with the difference that the unique part played by the Jewish people in the designs of Providence is attested by the word of God, whereas the exclusive importance of Russia can only be maintained on the word of certain Russian propagandists whose inspiration is far from infallible.

Moreover, since the ideas of our inspired patriots on the subject of the grounds of religious faith are by no means settled or clear, we must get on to more general ground and examine their claims from a purely natural and human point of view.

For the last forty or fifty years the patriots of Russia have been engaged in the fanatical repetition, with variations in every key, of one invariable phrase: Russia is great and has a sublime mission to fulfil in the world. In what exactly this mission consists and what Russia must do, what we ourselves must do, to fulfil it is always left undefined. Neither the old Slavophiles nor their present-day descendants nor M. Katkov himself have said anything definite on that subject.[3] They have talked of "light from the East," but it does not appear that this light has

---

[1] The title of a poem dedicated by a well-known poet to the late M. Katkov.

[2] This was the name given to Muscovy by certain Greek and Russian monks after the fall of the Byzantine Empire.

[3] The Pan-Slav politicians would have Russia destroy the Austrian Empire in order to form a Slav confederacy. And what then?

as yet enlightened their understanding or clarified their outlook. We may perhaps be allowed, therefore, while acknowledging the patriotic sentiments of these worthy gentlemen, to put to them plainly the question which they attempt to evade, the great question for our national conscience: How is Russia to justify her existence in the world?

For centuries, the history of our country was moving towards a single objective, the formation of a great national monarchy. The union of Ukraine and of a part of White Russia with Muscovite Russia under the Tsar Alexis was a decisive moment in this historic work; for that union put an end to the dispute for primacy between the Russia of the North and that of the South, between Moscow and Kiev, and gave a real meaning to the title of "Tsar of all the Russias." From that moment there was no longer any doubt of the success of the arduous task which the archbishops and princes of Moscow had undertaken since the fourteenth century. And by the logic of Providence it was the son of this very Tsar Alexis who went beyond the work of his predecessors and boldly put the further question: What must Russia do now that she is united and has become a powerful State? To this question the great Emperor gave the provisional reply that Russia must go to school with the civilized peoples of the West and assimilate their science and culture. That was indeed all that we needed for the moment. But this solution, simple and clear as it was, became more and more inadequate as the young society of Russia made progress in the school of Europe. The question then arose: What was she to do after her years of apprenticeship? The reformation of Peter the Great introduced Russia to the workshop of Europe in order to teach her how to handle all the tools of civilization, but it ignored those higher principles and ideals which guided the use of these tools. Consequently, though that reformation gave us the means of asserting ourse1ves, it did not reveal the ultimate aim of our existence as a nation. If it was justifiable to ask, What must barbarian Russia do? and if Peter was right in replying, She must be reformed and civilized; it is no less justifiable to ask, What must Russia do now that she has been reformed by Peter the Great and his successors? What is the aim of Russia today?

The Slavophiles must be given credit for having realized the extent of the problem; but they have done nothing to solve it. Reacting against the nebulous and barren idealism of Pan-Slavism, harder-headed patriots have in our time declared that it is not necessary that a nation should entertain a definite ideal or pursue any higher aim for mankind, but that it is quite enough that it should be independent and should enjoy institutions suited to its national genius and sufficient power and prestige to defend its material interests in the affairs of this world; for a good patriot it is enough to desire this much for his country and to labor to make her rich and powerful. All of which amounts to saying that nations live by their daily bread alone; and this is neither true nor desirable. The peoples of history have lived not

merely for themselves, but for the whole of mankind; by imperishable achievements, they have purchased the right to affirm their nationhood. That is the distinctive mark of a great people, and the patriotism which does not realize the price it must pay is a poor patriotism indeed.

No one asks what is the historic mission of the Ashanti or of the Eskimos. But when a Christian nation as vast and populous as ours, which has existed for a thousand years and is materially equipped to play a part in world history, asserts its rank as a great Power and claims an hegemony over other nations of the same race and a decisive influence in international politics, then it may well be asked what its real claims are to such a part in history, what principles or ideals it is contributing to the world, and what it has done or has still to do for the good of mankind as a whole.

But to answer these questions, we are told, is to anticipate the future. True, if we were concerned with a nation still in its infancy, the Russia of Kiev in the days of St. Vladimir, or the Muscovite Russia of Ivan Kalita. But modern Russia, which for the past two hundred years has played a continuous part on the stage of world history and which at the beginning of this century measured its strength against the greater part of Europe — this Russia ought to have some clear consciousness of its present tendencies and its future aims. Granted that the fulfilment of our historic mission belongs to the future, yet we must at least have some conception of that future; there must be in the Russia of to-day the living seed of its future destinies.

Little is achieved by those who are at a loss what to do next. Our ancestors of the fifteenth century saw clearly the future for which they were striving — the Empire of all the Russias. It surely cannot be that we, for whom that supreme goal of their endeavors is already an accomplished fact, have a less clear conception of our own future than they had of theirs. Nor can we imagine that that future will be realized without our co-operation in thought and action.

III

The true Orthodoxy of the Russian people and the pseudo-Orthodoxy of the anti-Catholic theologians.

THE distinctively religious character of the Russian people as well as the mystical tendency exhibited in our philosophy, our literature[1] and our arts seem to indicate for Russia a great religious mission. Moreover, when our patriots are pressed to state what it is that constitutes the supreme vocation of our country, or the Russian "idea," as it is called nowadays, they have no choice but to appeal to religion. According to them, Orthodoxy, or the religion of the Greco-Russian Church, in contrast to the religious bodies of the West, constitutes the true basis of our national being. Here, to begin with, is an obvious vicious circle. If we ask how the separated Eastern Church justifies its existence, we are told: By having formed the Russian people and provided its spiritual nurture. And when we enquire how that people justifies its existence, the answer is: By belonging to the separated Eastern Church. We are brought to this impasse by the difficulty of really deciding what we mean by this "Orthodoxy" of which we would claim the monopoly. This difficulty does not exist for those folk who are really orthodox in all good conscience and in the simplicity of their heart. When questioned intelligently about their religion, they will tell you that to be Orthodox is to be baptized a Christian, to wear a cross or some holy image on your breast, to worship Christ, to pray to the Blessed Virgin most immaculate[2] and to all the saints represented by images and relics, to rest from work on all festivals and to fast in

[1] Our best modem writers have been impelled by a religious idealism which has proved stronger than their æsthetic vocation to abandon the too restricted sphere of literature and to appear with varying success as moralists and reformers, apostles and prophets. The untimely death of Pushkin debars us from deciding whether the religious tendency shown in his most finished productions was deep enough to become in time predominant in his thought and to make him quit the domain of pure poetry, as happened with Gogol (in *Correspondence with my friends),* with Dostoyevski (in *An author's diary)* and with Tolstoy (in *My Confession, My Religion,* etc.). It seems that the Russian genius does not discover in poetic expression its final objective or the medium suited to the embodiment of its essentially religious ideal. If Russia is called to convey her message to the world, that message must sound forth not from the dazzling regions of art and literature, nor from the proud heights of philosophy and science, but only from the sublime and lowly peaks of religion. My Russian and Polish readers will find a detailed proof of this thesis in the second edition of my work, *La Question nationale en Russie,* the last chapter of which has been translated into Polish by M. Bénoni and published as a pamphlet entitled *Russia and Europe.*

[2] "Most immaculate" or "all-immaculate" *(vseneporochnaya)* is the epithet regularly added to the name of the Blessed Virgin in our liturgical books, being the translation of the Greek παντάμωμος and other kindred words.

accordance with traditional custom, to venerate the sacred office of bishops and priests, and to participate in the holy sacraments and in divine worship. That is the true Orthodoxy of the Russian people, and it is ours also. But it is not that of our militant patriots. It is obvious that true Orthodoxy contains nothing particularist and can in no way form a national or local attribute separating us in any sense from the Western peoples; for the greater part of these peoples, the Catholic part, has precisely the same religious basis that we have. Whatever is holy and sacred for us is also holy and sacred for them. To indicate only one essential point: not only is devotion to the Blessed Virgin one of the characteristic features of Catholicism — generally practiced by Russian Orthodoxy,[1] but there are even special miraculous images venerated in common by Roman Catholics and Russian Orthodox (for example, the holy Virgin of Czestochowa in Poland). If "piety" is indeed the distinctive characteristic of our national genius, the fact that the chief emblems of that piety are common to us and the Westerns compels us to recognize our oneness with them in what we regard as the most essential thing of all. As regards the profound contrast between the contemplative piety of the East and the active religion of the Westerns, this contrast, being purely human and subjective, has nothing to do with the divine objects of our faith and worship; so far from being a good reason for schism, it should rather bring the two great parts of the Christian world into a closer and mutually complementary union.

But under the influence of that evil principle which is constantly at work on Earth, this difference has been abused and twisted into a division. At the moment when Russia was receiving baptism from Constantinople, the Greeks, though still in formal communion with Rome after the temporary schism of Photius,[2] were already strongly imbued with national particularism which was fostered by the contentious spirit of the clergy, the political ambitions of the emperors, and the disputes of the theologians. The result was that the pearl of the Gospel purchased by the Russian people in the person of St. Vladimir was all covered with the dust of Byzantium. The bulk of the nation was uninterested in the ambitions and hatreds of the clergy and understood nothing of the theological quibbles which were their fruit; the bulk of the nation received and preserved the essence of orthodox Christianity pure and simple, that is to say, faith and the life of religion formed by divine grace and expressed in works of piety and charity. But the clergy, recruited

[1] By this term I do not exclude the "old believers" properly so called, whose differences with the State Church are not concerned with the true object of religion.

[2] The final rupture, which did not occur till later, in 1054, was nothing in fact but a mere event without any kind of legal or binding sanction. The anathema of the legates of Pope Leo IX was not aimed against the Eastern Church, but solely against the person of the patriarch Michael Cerularius and against "the partners of his folly" (folly obvious enough, to be sure); and, on the other hand, the Eastern Church has never been able to assemble an œcumenical council which, even according to our own theologians, is the only tribunal competent to pass judgment on our differences with the Papacy.

in the early days from the Greeks, and the theologians accepted the disastrous inheritance of Photius and Cerularius as an integral part of the true religion.

This pseudo-Orthodoxy of our theological schools, which has nothing in common with the faith of the Universal Church or the piety of the Russian people, contains no positive element; it consists merely of arbitrary negations produced and maintained by controversial prejudice:

"God the Son does not contribute in the divine order to the procession of the Holy Spirit."

"The Blessed Virgin was not immaculate from the first moment of her existence." [1]

"Primacy of jurisdiction does not belong to the see of Rome and the Pope has not the dogmatic authority of a Pastor and Doctor of the Universal Church."

Such are the principal negations which we shall have to examine in due course. For our present purpose it is enough to observe in the first place that these negations have received no sort of religious sanction, and do not rest on any ecclesiastical authority accepted by all the Orthodox as binding and infallible. No œcumenical council has condemned or even passed judgment on the Catholic doctrines anathematized by our controversialists; and when we are offered this new kind of negative theology as the true doctrine of the Universal Church, we can see in it only an extravagant imposture originating either in ignorance or in bad faith. In the second place, it is obvious that this false Orthodoxy is no more adequate than true Orthodoxy as a positive basis for the "Russian idea." Let us try to substitute real values for this unknown quantity called "Orthodoxy" over which a pseudo-patriotic press is always working up an artificial enthusiasm. According to you the ideal essence of Russia is Orthodoxy, and this Orthodoxy, which you especially contrast with Catholicism, amounts in your view simply to the divergences between the two professions of faith. The real religious basis which is common to us and the Westerns seems to have no more than a secondary interest for you; it is the differences between us to which you are really attached. Very well, then, substitute these specific differences for the vague term "Orthodoxy" and declare openly that the religious ideal of Russia consists in denying the *Filioque,* the Immaculate Conception, and the authority of the Pope. It is the last point that you are chiefly concerned with. The others, you know well, are only pretexts; the Sovereign Pontiff is your real bugbear. All your "Orthodoxy," all your "Russian idea" is, at bottom, then, simply a national protest against the universal power of the Pope. But in the name of what? Here begins the real difficulty of your position. This bitter protest against the monarchy of the Church, if it is to win men's minds

---

[1] Thus these theologians blinded by hatred have the temerity to deny the manifest belief of the Eastern Church, both Greek and Russian, which has never ceased to declare the Blessed Virgin to be all-immaculate, immaculate par *excellence.*

and hearts, should be justified by some great positive principle. You should confront the form of theocratic government of which you disapprove with another and better form. And that is exactly what you cannot do. What kind of ecclesiastical constitution would you confer upon the Western peoples? Are you going to extol conciliar government and talk to them of œcumenical councils? *Medice, cura teipsum.* Why has not the East set up a *true* œcumenical council in opposition to those of Trent or the Vatican? How are we to explain this helpless silence on the part of Truth when faced with the solemn self-assertion of Error? Since when have the guardians of Orthodoxy become mean-spirited curs that can only bark from behind a wall? In point of fact, while the great assemblies of the Church continue to fill a prominent place in the teaching and life of Catholicism, it is the Christian East which has for a thousand years been deprived of this important feature of the Universal Church, and our best theologians, such as Philaret of Moscow, themselves admit that an œcumenical council is impossible for the Eastern Church as long as she remains separated from the West. But it is the easiest thing in the world for our self-styled Orthodox to confront the actual councils of the Catholic Church with a council that can never take place and to maintain their cause with weapons that they have lost and under a flag of which they have been robbed.

The Papacy is a positive principle, an actual institution, and if Eastern Christians believe this principle to be false and this institution to be evil, it is for them to create the organization which they desire to see in the Church. Instead of doing so, they refer us to antiquarian traditions, though they admit that they can have no relevance to the present situation. Our anti-Catholics have indeed good reason for going so far afield in search of support for their thesis; the fact is that they dare not expose themselves to the ridicule of the whole world by declaring the synod of St. Petersburg or the patriarchate of Constantinople to be the real representative of the Universal Church. But how can they talk of appealing, after all this time, to œcumenical councils when they are obliged to admit that they are no longer feasible? Such beating of the air is only a complete revelation of the weakness of this anti-Catholic Orthodoxy. If the normal organization and proper constitution of the Universal Church requires œcumenical councils, it is obvious that the Orthodox East, fatally deprived of this essential organ of Church life, possesses no longer a true Church constitution or a regular Church government. During the first three centuries of Christianity, the Church, cemented by the blood of the martyrs, convoked no world-wide councils because she had no need of them; the Eastern Church of to-day, paralyzed and dismembered, is unable to convoke them though she feels her need of them. Thus we are placed in a dilemma: either we must admit, with our extreme sectarians, that since a certain date the Church has lost her divine character and no longer actually exists upon Earth; or else, to avoid, so dangerous a

conclusion, we must recognize that the Universal Church, having no organs of government or representation in the East, possesses them in her Western half. This will involve the recognition of a historical truth now admitted even by the Protestants, namely that the present-day Papacy is not an arbitrary usurpation, but a legitimate development of principles which were in full force before the division of the Church and against which that Church never protested. But if the Papacy is recognized as a legitimate institution, what becomes of the “Russian idea” and the privilege of national Orthodoxy? If we cannot base our religious future on the official Church, perhaps we can find deeper foundations for it in the Russian people.

IV

Russian dissent. The relative truth of the Raskol. Mgr. Philaret of Moscow and his conception of the Universal Church.

IF we wish to state Orthodoxy in terms of the Russian national ideal, logic compels us to seek the true expression of that ideal among our native sects and not within the domain of the official Church, whose origin is Greek and whose organization, given her by Peter the Great, is Teutonic. Deprived of any specific principle or practical independence, this "Ministry of the Spiritual Affairs of the Orthodox Communion" can only reproduce the imperial clericalism of Byzantium modified by the easy-going good nature of our own people and the Teutonic bureaucracy of our administration. Apart from the particular causes which produced the Raskol,[1] and which have only a historical importance, it may be confidently asserted that the reason for the persistence of this schism within the nation is the obvious inadequacy of Russian Church government coupled with its exaggerated pretensions. This Church "established" by the Tsar, though totally subservient to the secular power and destitute of all inner vitality, none the less makes use of the hierarchical idea to assume over the people an absolute authority which by right belongs only to the independent Universal Church founded by Christ. The emptiness of these claims, sensed rather than consciously recognized, has driven one section of our dissenters to fruitless attempts at constituting a Russian Orthodox Church independent of the State, while another and larger section has quite frankly declared that the true Church has completely disappeared from the world since the year 1666, and that we are living under the spiritual rule of Antichrist, resident at St. Petersburg. It is plain why the advocates of the "Russian idea" take good care not to look too closely into the Raskol, nor to seek this elusive "idea" in that quarter. A doctrine which affirms that the Russian Church and monarchy are subject to the absolute rule of Antichrist and which postpones all hope of a better state of affairs to the end of the world, obviously does not harmonize very well with an extravagant patriotism which represents Russia in her present condition as the second Israel and the chosen people of the

[1] The generic name of *raskol* (schism) is in use among us to denote especially those of the dissenters who separated from the official Church over the question of rites and who are also called *starovery* (old believers). The separation was finally consummated in the years 1666-1667, when a council assembled at Moscow anathematized the old rites.

future. Nevertheless, it is of interest to note that it is precisely those who would have Russia undertake a religious mission all her own, namely the Slavophiles, who are compelled to ignore or to depreciate the one historical phenomenon in which the religious genius of the Russian people has shown a certain originality. On the other hand, in some of our liberal and radical "Westernizing" [1] circles, our national Protestantism, in spite of the barbarous forms it assumes, finds ready champions who imagine that they discern in it the promise of a better future for the Russian people. We ourselves, having no reason either to belittle or to overestimate this typical phenomenon of our religious history, are able to view it more objectively. We do not underrate the great part played in the rise of the Raskol by the profoundest ignorance, ultra-democratic tendencies, and the spirit of revolt. We shall not, therefore, look to it for any higher truth or any positive religious ideal. Nevertheless, we are bound to note that there has always been a spark of the divine fire in this crude and even senseless incitement of the passions of the mob. There is in it a burning thirst for religious truth, a compelling need for a true and living Church. Our national Protestantism aims its shafts at a partial and imperfect manifestation of ecclesiastical government and not at the principle of the visible Church. Even the most advanced section of our "old believers" regard an actual organized Church as so necessary that, because they are robbed of it, they believe themselves to be already under the rule of Antichrist. Allowing for the ignorance which leads them to mistake Russia for the whole world, there is to be found at the bottom of all these queer errors the idea or the axiom of a Church independent of the State and closely bound up with the whole intimate social life of the people — a free, powerful and living Church. And if our dissenters see the official Church, whether Russian or Greek, without independence or vitality, and declare that therefore she is not the true Church of Christ, they are at least consistent in their error.

The negative truth implied in the Raskol remains unassailable. Neither the bloody persecutions of past generations, nor the oppression of a modern bureaucracy, nor the official hostility of our clergy has done anything to meet the unanswerable contention that *there exists no truly spiritual government in the Greco-Russian Church.* But this is as far as the truth of our national Protestantism goes. As soon as the "old believers" abandon this simple denial and claim to have discovered some outlet for their religious instincts or to have realized their ideal of the Church, they fall into obvious contradictions and absurdities which make them an easy target for their opponents. It is not difficult for the latter to meet the *Popovtsy*[2] by proving that a religious society which has been for generations

---

[1] This is the name (in Russian, *Zapadniki)* given to the literary party opposed to the Slavophiles and attached to the principles of European civilization.

[2] A moderate party which by unlawful means is now in possession of a priesthood and even, since 1848, of an

deprived of the episcopate and which has only partially recovered this fundamental institution by entirely uncanonical proceedings cannot be the genuine continuation of the ancient Church and the sole guardian of the Orthodox tradition. It is no less easy to establish in answer to the *Bespopovtsy*[1] the proposition that the reign of Antichrist cannot be of indefinite length, and that logically these dissenters should repudiate not only the Church of the present day but also that of former times which, in their opinion, was destroyed in the year of grace 1666; for a Church against which the gates of Hell have prevailed cannot have been the true Church of Christ.

The great historical importance of the Raskol, with its thousands of martyrs, is the witness which it bears to the depth of religious sentiment among the Russian people and to the lively interest aroused in them by the theocratic conception of the Church. If it is, on the one hand, a matter for great joy that the majority of the populace has remained faithful to the official Church which, despite the absence of any lawful Church government,[2] has at least preserved the apostolic succession and the validity of the sacraments, it would, on the other hand, have been deplorable had the entire Russian people been content with this official Church, such as it is; that would be a convincing proof that there was no religious future to be hoped for. The vehement and persistent protest of these millions of peasants gives us an earnest of the future regeneration of our Church life. But the essentially negative character of this religious movement is a sufficient proof that the Russian people, just like every other human power left to its own resources, is incapable of realizing its highest ideal. All these aspirations and tentative movements towards a true Church indicate no more than a passive capacity for religion which needs an act of moral regeneration coming from a higher source than the purely national and popular element if it is to be effectively realized in a concrete organic form.

We may grant that the official Church ruled by a civil servant is nothing but a State institution, a minor branch of the bureaucratic administration; but the Church conceived by our dissenters would at the most be a merely national and democratic Church. It is the idea of the Universal Church which is lacking on both sides. The article of the Creed concerning the *one,* holy, *catholic* and apostolic Church, though sung at every Mass and recited at every Baptism, remains as much a dead letter for the "old Orthodox" as for the "ruling Church." For the former, the Church is the Russian nation — in its entirety up to the time of the patriarch Nikon, and since his time in that section of it which has remained faithful to the old national

---

episcopate, whose center is at Fontana Alba in Austria.

[1] A radical party which holds that the priesthood and all the sacraments, with the exception of Baptism, have been completely non-existent since 1666.

[2] All our bishops are nominated in a manner absolutely forbidden and condemned by the third canon of the seventh Œcumenical Council, a canon which in the eyes of our own Church can never have been abrogated (for lack of subsequent œcumenical councils). We shall have to return to this subject later.

rite. As for the theologians of the official Church, their ideas on the subject are as vague as they are inconsistent. But the feature which is constant among all their variations and common to them all, in spite of their differences, is the absence of a positive faith in the Universal Church. Here, to confine ourselves to a single writer who is worth a host of others, is the theory of the Church expounded by Archbishop Philaret, the able Metropolitan of Moscow, in one of his most important works:[1]

"The true Christian Church includes all the particular Churches which confess Jesus Christ 'come in the flesh.' The *doctrine* of all these religious societies is fundamentally the same divine truth; but it may be mingled with the opinions and errors of men. Hence, there is in the *teaching* of these individual Churches a distinction of greater and less purity. The doctrine of the Eastern Church is purer than the rest, indeed it may be recognized as completely pure, since it does not link the divine truth to any human opinion. However, as each religious communion makes exactly the same claim to perfect purity of faith and doctrine, it does not behoove us to judge others, but rather to leave the final judgment to the Spirit of God Who guides the Churches."

Such is the opinion of Mgr. Philaret and the majority of the Russian clergy agree with him. The breadth and conciliatory nature of this view cannot conceal its essential defects. The principle of unity and universality in the Church only extends, it would seem, to the common ground of Christian faith, namely the dogma of the Incarnation. This truly fundamental faith in Jesus Christ, the God-Man, is not regarded as the living and fruitful seed of a further development; the theologian of Moscow would rather see in it the final unity of the Christian world and the only unity which he considers necessary. He is content to ignore the divergences that exist in the Christian religion and declares himself satisfied with the purely theoretical unity thus obtained. It is a unity based on a broad but hollow indifference, implying no organic bond and requiring no effective fellowship between particular Churches. The Universal Church is reduced to a logical concept. Its parts are real, but the whole is nothing but a subjective abstraction. Even if it has not always been thus, if the Church in her entirety was once a living body, yet that body is today a prey to death and dissolution; it is only the existence of the separate parts that is actually manifest before our eyes, while their substantial unity has vanished into the realm of the unseen world.

This idea of a "dead Church" is not merely the logical conclusion which we believe to be implicit in the propositions advanced by our renowned theologian; he has labored to describe to us the Universal Church as he conceived it under the form of a lifeless body made up of heterogeneous and distinct elements. He has

[1] *Conversation of an inquirer and a believer on the truth of the Eastern Church.*

even been inspired to apply to the Church of Christ and to the stages of its historical existence the vision of the great idol recorded in the book of Daniel. The golden head of the idol is the early Christian Church; the chest and arms of silver signify “the Church growing in strength and extent” (the age of the martyrs); the brazen stomach is “the Church in prosperity” (the triumph of Christianity and the age of the great doctors). Finally, the Church of the present, “the Church in its divided and fragmentary condition,” is represented by the two feet with their toes, in which clay is mingled with iron by the hands of men. To accept this ill-omened symbol seriously would mean the denial of the one, infallible and impregnable Church of God founded to last for all generations. The author perceived as much, and in subsequent editions of his work he erased the whole of this allegory; but he found nothing to put in its place. It must, however, be confessed that in limiting the application of this symbol to the official Greco-Russian Church the distinguished representative of that institution displayed both acumen and impartiality. Iron and clay mixed by the hand of man — violence and impotence, and an artificial unity which needs only a shock to reduce it to powder: no simile could better depict the actual condition of our established Church.

V

Critical observations on the Russian Slavophiles and their ideas concerning the Church.

ARCHBISHOP Philaret inadvertently laid bare the real condition of the separated Eastern Church. The Slavophiles have attempted to conceal her nakedness under the transparent veil of an idealistic theory of the Church "in its free and living unity founded on divine grace and Christian charity." Their doctrine, in so far as it envisages the Church in general terms as a moral organism, is perfectly true, and they must be given credit for having insisted *in theory* upon its essential and indivisible unity which has been so completely ignored by our official theologians and our dissenters. On the other hand, those who consider that the Slavophiles, in expounding the positive conception of the Universal Church confine themselves too much to vague generalizations, will find this same conception of the Church much more fully and clearly developed by certain Catholic writers, especially by the famous Möhler in his admirable work, *Die Symbolik der christlichen Kirche.*[1]

The Church is One is the title given by Khomyakov, the leader of the Slavophile group in Russia, to a small volume of dogmatic theology which, though insignificant in itself, deserves notice as the only attempt on the part of the Slavophiles to fix and systematize their theological ideas. The unity of the Church is determined by the unity of the divine Grace which, if it is to work within men and transform them into a Church of God, demands from them fidelity to a common tradition, brotherly charity and that free consent of the individual conscience which is the definite guarantee of the truth of their faith. It is on this last point especially that the Slavophiles insist in their definition of the true Church as "the *spontaneous, inward* synthesis of unity and freedom in charity."

What objection can there be to such an ideal? Is there any Roman Catholic who, on being shown the whole of mankind or a considerable section of it inspired with divine love and brotherly charity, having but one heart and one soul, and abiding thus in a free and wholly interior unity — is there, I ask, any Roman Catholic who would wish to impose upon such a society the external and binding jurisdiction of

[1] This work is commended and frequently quoted in the *Prælectiones theologicæ* of the official dogmatic theologian of the Latin Church, the late Fr. Perrone, professor at the *Collegium Romanum* and member of the Society of Jesus.

a public religious authority? Do any papists believe that the Seraphim and Cherubim need a Pope to govern them? And, on the other hand, is there any Protestant who, if he saw the actual attainment of final truth through "the perfection of charity," would still insist on the exercise of private judgment?

The perfectly free and inward union of men with the Godhead and with one another — that is the supreme goal, the haven towards which we steer our course. Our Western brethren are not agreed among themselves as to the best method of reaching it. Catholics believe that it is *safer* to cross the sea together in a large and seaworthy vessel built by a famous master, navigated by a skilful pilot and equipped with all that is necessary for the voyage. Protestants, on the contrary, claim that it is for each one to construct a cockle-shell to his own liking that he may pursue his uncertain course *with greater freedom.* This latter opinion, however mistaken, is at least arguable. But what is to be said to these self-styled Orthodox who maintain that the best way of reaching harbor is to pretend that you are there already, and who think that in this respect they have the advantage of their Western brethren? The latter, it must be admitted, have never suspected that the great problem of religion was capable of so simple a solution.

The Church is one and indivisible; yet it may at the same time comprise various spheres, not to be separated but to be clearly distinguished from one another; otherwise, it would be impossible to understand the past or present history of religion or to do anything for the religious future of mankind. Absolute perfection can only belong to that higher part of the Church which has already once for all appropriated and assimilated the fullness of the divine grace — the Church triumphant or the realm of Glory. Midway between this divine sphere and the purely earthly elements of visible humanity stands the divine-human organism of the Church, invisible in its mystical power and visible in its present manifestation, sharing equally in the perfection of Heaven and in the conditions of material existence. This is the Church, properly speaking, and it is with her that we are concerned. She is not perfect in the absolute sense, but she must possess all the necessary means of secure progress towards the supreme ideal — the perfect unity of the whole creation in God — in spite of countless obstacles and difficulties, through the struggles, temptations and weaknesses of men.

Here below, the Church has not the perfect unity of the heavenly kingdom, but nevertheless she must have a certain real unity, a bond at once organic and spiritual which constitutes her a concrete institution, a living body and a moral individual. Though she does not include the whole of mankind in an actual material sense, she is nevertheless *universal* in so far as she cannot be confined exclusively to any one nation or group of nations, but must have an international center from which to spread throughout the whole universe. The Church here below, though she is founded on the revelation of God and is the guardian of the deposit of faith, does

not therefore enjoy absolute and immediate knowledge of all truths; but she is *infallible,* that is to say, she cannot be mistaken when, at a given moment, she defines such and such a religious or moral truth, the explicit knowledge of which has become necessary to her. The Church on Earth is not absolutely free, since she is subject to the conditions of finite existence; but she must be sufficiently *independent* to be able to carry on a constant and active struggle against the powers of the enemy and to prevent the gates of Hell from prevailing against her.

Such is the true Church on Earth, the Church which, in spite of the imperfection of her human element, has received from God the right, the power and all the required means to raise and guide mankind towards its appointed end. Were she not one and universal, she could not serve as the foundation of the positive unity of all peoples, which is her chief mission. Were she not infallible, she could not guide mankind in the true way; she would be a blind leader of the blind. Finally, were she not independent, she could not fulfil her duty towards society; she would become the instrument of the powers of this world and would completely fail in her mission.

The essential and indispensable characteristics of the true Church are, it seems, settled and clear enough. Nevertheless, our modern Orthodox, after confusing the divine and the earthly aspects of the Church in their nebulous reasonings, are quite prepared to identify this muddled ideal with the present-day Eastern Church, the Greco-Russian Church as we see it. They affirm it to be the one and only Church of God, the true Universal Church, and they regard other communions as nothing but anti-Christian associations. Thus, while accepting in theory the idea of the Universal Church, the Slavophiles deny it in fact and reduce the worldwide character of Christianity to one particular Church which in other respects is far from corresponding to the ideal which they themselves uphold. According to their notion, as we have seen, the true Church is "the organic synthesis of freedom and unity in charity," and it is in the Greco-Russian Church, they say, that we are to look for this synthesis! Let us try to take them seriously and see what there is in the idea.

VI

Religious freedom and ecclesiastical freedom

IN the sphere of religion and of the Church, two very different things may be understood by the word “freedom:” first, the independence of the *ecclesiastical body,* both the clergy and the faithful, in relation to the external power of the State, and secondly, the independence *of individuals* in matters of religion, that is to say, the concession to everyone of the right to belong *openly* to such and such a religious body, to pass freely from one of these bodies to another, or to belong to none and to profess *with impunity* any kind of religious belief or opinion whether positive or negative.[1] To avoid confusion, we will call the former “ecclesiastical freedom” and the latter “religious freedom.”[2] Every Church takes for granted a certain number of common beliefs, and anyone who does not share these beliefs cannot enjoy the same community of rights as the believers. The power to take action by spiritual means against unfaithful members and definitely to exclude them from the community is one of the essential attributes *of ecclesiastical* freedom. *Religious* freedom does not come within the particular province of the Church except indirectly; it is only the temporal power of the State which can directly admit or restrict the right of its subjects to profess openly all their individual religious beliefs. The Church can only exert a moral influence to induce the State to be more or less tolerant. No Church ever regarded with indifference the propagation of strange beliefs which threatened to rob her of her faithful children. But the question remains: What weapons should the Church employ against her enemies? Ought she to confine herself to spiritual means of persuasion, or should she have recourse to the State and avail herself of its material weapons, constraint and persecution? The two methods of struggle against the enemies of the Church are not mutually exclusive. Those who have the necessary equipment can distinguish between intellectual error and bad faith and, while bringing persuasion to bear on the former, can guard against the latter by depriving it of the means of

[1] We are not concerned here with a third kind of freedom, that of the various cults recognized by the State. A certain freedom for the cults in their *status quo* is imposed by the force of circumstances upon an Empire such as Russia, which numbers more than 30,000,000 subjects outside the ruling Church.

[2] The expressions commonly used in the latter sense, such as “freedom of conscience” or “freedom of profession of faith” should be rejected as inexact; conscience is always free and no one can prevent a martyr from confessing his-faith.

doing harm.[1] But there is one essential condition if the spiritual struggle is to be even possible, namely, that the Church herself should enjoy *ecclesiastical* freedom and should not be reduced to subservience to the State. A man who has his hands tied cannot defend himself by his own efforts, but is compelled to rely on the assistance of others. A State Church totally subject to the secular power and owing its continued existence to the favor of the latter has renounced its spiritual authority and can only be defended successfully by material weapons.[2]

In past times the Roman Catholic Church, which has always enjoyed a measure of ecclesiastical freedom and has never been a State Church, has encountered her enemies with the spiritual weapons of instruction and preaching and at the same time has authorized Catholic States to use the temporal sword in the name of religious unity. Today there are no longer any Catholic States; the State in the West is atheist, and the Roman Church continues to exist and to prosper in sole reliance upon the spiritual sword, upon her moral authority and upon the free proclamation of her principles. But how can a hierarchy that has committed itself to the temporal power, and thereby admitted its own lack of spiritual power, exert that moral authority which it has renounced? Our present established Church has espoused the interests of the State to the exclusion of all else, in order to receive in return the guarantee of its existence against the menace of dissent. Since the aim is a purely material one, the means are bound to be of the same character. The measures of constraint and violence prescribed by the Imperial Penal Code are in the last resort the only weapons of defense with which our "State Orthodoxy" can meet either dissent at home or religious bodies from without which would dispute its authority over the souls of our people. If, in recent times, the representatives of the clergy have made certain attempts to counter the sectarians by means of semi-public discussions,[3] the lack of good faith which is only too evident in these conferences (in which one side is bound to be in the wrong whatever happens, and is able to say only what its opponents permit) has merely had the effect of showing up the moral impotence of an established Church which is too accommodating to the powers that be to win respect and too ruthless in its spiritual claims to win affection. And

---

[1] We admit this distinction in theory *(in abstracto)* but we are far from recommending it as a practical policy.

[2] Even our ecclesiastical writers admit as much with considerable naïveté. For instance, in a series of articles in the *Orthodox Review (Pravoslavnoye Obozrenie)* on the struggle of the Russian clergy against the dissenters, the author, M. Chistyakov, after exposing the exploits of Pitirim, the bishop of Nizhni-Novgorod, whose zeal was invariably supported by the troops of the vice-governor Rzhevski, reaches the conclusion that the famous missionary owed all his success to the help of the secular power and to the right of bringing the dissenters by force to listen to his preaching *(Prav. Obozr.,* October 1887, p. 348). Similar admissions can be found in the same Review (of the year 1882) with regard to contemporary missions among the pagans of Eastern Siberia.

[3] I refer to the "conversations *(sobesedovanya)* with the old believers" at Kazan, at Kaluga, and especially at Moscow. Despite the irksome conditions of these discussions and the absence of the leaders of the Raskol, the representatives of the official Church did not always have it their own way. A paper named *The Moscow Voice (Golos Moskvy),* which had the courage to publish in 1885 the shorthand reports of these conferences, has had reason to repent of its rashness. It no longer exists.

yet this is the Church that is to exemplify for us the free union of human consciences in the spirit of charity!

The Slavophiles, in their anti-Catholic propaganda, have labored to confuse ecclesiastical with religious freedom. Since the Catholic Church has not always been tolerant, and since she does not admit the principle of indifference in religious matters, it is only too easy to declaim against the despotism of Rome without mentioning the great prerogative of ecclesiastical freedom which Catholicism alone of all Christian communions has always maintained. But when it comes to our own case, nothing is gained by the confusion of these two freedoms since it is clear that we possess neither. No one has expounded this melancholy truth with greater power or conviction than the late I. Aksakov, the last notable representative of the old school of Slavophiles. We need not quote more than a few outstanding passages from his writings.[1]

[1] For a long time, Aksakov was persecuted by the Russian Government for the frankness of his criticisms. Only in his last years did he share with Karkov the privilege of free speech — a privilege which was peculiar to these two men and has not survived them.

VII

I. S. Aksakov on the official Church in Russia

THE general aide-de-camp's shoulder-knots *(Achselband)* with which Mgr. Ireneus, archbishop of Pskov and member of the Holy Synod, was decorated in the reign of Paul I are a symbol of the relations between Church and State in Russia. It should cause no surprise to see this secular, not to say military, decoration upon the archbishop's cassock; it merely proves that the fundamental conception of our ecclesiastical constitution has been consistently developed ever since the time of Peter the Great." [1]

"As is well known, the Russian Church is governed by an administrative council called a Spiritual Conclave or Holy Synod, whose members are nominated by the Emperor and are presided over by a civil or military official, the High Procurator of the Holy Synod, who has complete control of the government of the Church. The dioceses, or eparchies, are nominally ruled by bishops nominated by the Head of the State on the recommendation of the Synod, that is, of the High Procurator who may subsequently depose them at pleasure.

"The various degrees in the clerical hierarchy have been recorded in the *List of Ranks* and made to correspond exactly with the various military grades. A metropolitan is equivalent to a marshal ('full general' according to the Russian expression), an archbishop to a divisional general (or 'lieutenant-general), and a bishop to a brigade general (or 'major-general'). Priests may, with a little keenness, reach the rank of colonel. Paul I was only being consistent in bestowing military decorations on the dignitaries of the Church." [2]

"Are such things unimportant details or matters of purely external significance? On the contrary, it is these outward features that reflect the inner condition of our Church. Enrolled in the service of the State, the servants of the altar regard themselves as the employees and agents of the secular power. If the latter rewards the services of the clergy with lay decorations, it is because the clergy themselves covet these rewards.[3] The Synod of St. Petersburg, from its earliest years, insisted upon its character as an imperial institution and never failed to quote the temporal

---

[1] I. S. Aksakov, *Complete Works,* vol. iv., p. 119.
[2] *ibid*., p. 120.
[3] *ibid*., p. 121.

power as the true source of its authority. In all its early official acts, it repeats over and over again that 'command has been given' *(poveleno)* by the sovereign to everyone, 'to persons of every rank, ecclesiastics and laity, to regard the Synod as an important and powerful body' and in no way to disparage 'the dignity bestowed upon it by His Majesty the Tsar.' It is easy to see that the element of temporal authority from which the Synod thought to draw its strength was bound inevitably to prevail over every other element in its composition and to dominate completely this hybrid institution which, though declaring itself to be an organ of the secular power, none the less claimed the authority of an ecclesiastical council.[1] The dignity bestowed upon it by His Majesty the Tsar was to be disparaged by no one — excepting His Majesty. And it was thus that the High Procurator Yakovlev obtained an imperial order severely forbidding the Synod to carry on direct correspondence with anyone whatsoever; all communications ('every document' according to the Russian expression) concerning Church affairs were to be transmitted to the Procurator.

"Thus, our Church on its administrative side has the appearance of a kind of huge bureau or chancellery which brings to the task of feeding Christ's flock all the methods of German bureaucracy with all its inherent official insincerity.[2] When once the government of the Church is organized as a department of the secular administration and her ministers are reckoned as civil servants, there is little to prevent the Church herself from being transformed into an agency of the secular power and undisguisedly entering the service of the State. With 'the rights and privileges of fiscal administration *(kazna)*' which Russian law grants to the Established Church, the fiscal *(kazenny)* element has penetrated deep into her life. Outwardly all that was done was to introduce the necessary discipline into the Church; actually, she was robbed of her soul. The ideal of a truly spiritual administration was replaced by that of a purely formal and external discipline. It was not a question merely of the secular power, but principally of the secular way of thinking which found its way into the heart of our Church administration and gained such a hold upon the minds and souls of our clergy that they have well nigh lost all notion of the true and living meaning of the Church's mission." [3]

This statement is supported by a whole collection of tracts and proposals for Church reform sent to Aksakov by the "intelligentsia and progressives" among our clergy and all without exception marked by the same anti-religious secularism.[4] "Some suggest that the enthusiasm of preachers should be revived by a new system of official rewards in the shape of special decorations. Others insist that the State

[1] *ibid.,* p. 122.
[2] *ibid.,* p. 124.
[3] *ibid.,* pp. 125, 126.
[4] *ibid.,* p. 126.

must formally guarantee the lower clergy protection against the power of the bishops. Others believe that our religious future depends upon an increase in the ecclesiastical revenues; they would therefore have the State grant the Churches the monopoly of certain branches of industry. Some even suggest the introduction of a scale of charges for the administration of the holy sacraments. . . . Some go so far as to assert that our religious life is not sufficiently regulated by the government, and they demand a new code of laws and rules for the Church. And yet in the present Imperial Code there are more than a thousand articles regulating the supervision of the Church by the State and defining the duties of the police in the sphere of religious belief and practice. The secular administration is declared by our Code to be the upholder of the dogmas of the established religion and the guardian of good discipline in the holy Church." We see this guardian, with sword raised, ready to deal sternly with any offence against this Orthodoxy which owes its establishment not so much to the aid of the Holy Spirit as to that of the penal laws of the Russian Empire.[1]

"The High Procurator of the Synod, as the responsible head of the Church, presents to the Emperor an annual report on the state of that institution. In form and style there is no difference between this report and those of other ministries, for instance the Ministry of Transport. Its contents are divided and subdivided in the same way; only instead of such titles as 'Highways,' 'Railways,' 'Navigable Rivers,' the report of the High Procurator contains the headings: 'Maintenance and spread of the faith,' 'Pastoral activity,' 'Manifestations of religious feeling, of devotion to the sacred person of His Majesty,' etc." [2] The report for the year 1866, analyzed by Aksakov, concludes in the following characteristic manner: "The Russian Church, infinitely indebted for her prosperity to the august solicitude of the Sovereign, has embarked upon a new year of her existence with renewed strength and greater promise for the future." [3]

The Church has renounced her ecclesiastical freedom; and the State in return has guaranteed her existence and her position as the established Church by suppressing religious freedom throughout Russia. "Where there is no living inward unity," says Aksakov, "outward uniformity can only be maintained by violence and deception." [4] These are harsh words from a patriotic Russian; but they are none the less true. The precarious and uncertain unity of our Church rests upon nothing but deception and violence practiced by, or at least under the ægis of, the government. From the forged decrees of a fictitious council against an imaginary heretic[5] up to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 84.
[2] Ibid., p. 75.
[3] Ibid., p. 77.
[4] Ibid., p. 100.
[5] I refer to the decrees of the imaginary council of Kiev in 1157, in which all the opinions of the "old believers" of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were imputed to Martin the Armenian, a heretic of the twelfth century, who

the recent falsifications in the translation of the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils published by the Ecclesiastical Academy of Kazan, the whole activity of our Church, both in propaganda and in defense, is simply a series of deceptions carried out in complete security, thanks to the watchful protection of the ecclesiastical censorship which forestalls every attempt at exposure. As for the use of violence in religious matters, it is recognized in theory and developed in detail in our Penal Code. Any person born in the established Church or converted to Orthodoxy who embraces another religion, even though it is Christian, incurs a criminal charge and must be tried before the courts on the same footing as counterfeiters and highwaymen. Whoever induces anyone to leave the established Church, even if only by persuasion, without any constraint or violence, is deprived of civil rights and deported to Siberia or thrown into prison. Such severity is by no means a dead letter with us; Aksakov had the opportunity of observing it at work in the cruel persecution of a Protestant sect in Southern Russia.

"To stifle with imprisonment the thirst for religion, for lack of anything wherewith to satisfy it, to answer with imprisonment the genuine desire for faith and the questionings aroused in the religious mind, to use imprisonment as an argument for the truth of Orthodoxy — this is to undermine the whole of our religion and to surrender to victorious Protestantism. Such weapons of defense and such methods of establishing orthodox truth must soon supersede and destroy all pastoral zeal, and must stamp out every spark of true religion. The stringent orders issued by the ecclesiastical officials compelling the clergy under threat of fines to establish schools can never introduce real popular religious instruction; and we hope that it will not seem too sceptical to suggest that the recent ukase which grants to priests engaged in the work of popular education the right to the Cross of St. Anne of the 3rd class and to the rank of knighthood will not succeed in raising up new Apostles." [1]

And yet it is a fact that the penal laws are absolutely essential to the maintenance of this "established Church." The sincerest champions of that Church, such as the historian Pogodin, whom our author quotes, admit that, if religious freedom were once introduced into Russia, half the peasants would go over to the Raskol and half the upper classes, especially the women, would become Catholics. "What does such an admission imply?" asks Aksakov. "That half the members of the Orthodox Church belong to her only in name; that they are kept within her fold only by the fear of temporal penalties. This is what our Church has come to! It is a dishonorable, depressing and monstrous state of affairs, this riot of sacrilege in the

---

in fact never existed. This imposture was so crude and improbable that even our ecclesiastical schools were for a time ashamed of it. But latterly the recrudescence of official obscurantism has brought about the revival of this invention of Bishop Pitirim (*v.* the article already quoted from *Prav. Obozr.,* October 1887. pp. 306, 307, 314).

[1] Aksakov, *ibid.,* p. 72.

sacred precincts, of hypocrisy ousting truth, of terror in place of love, of corruption under the guise of outward order, of bad faith in violent defense of the true faith! What a denial, within the Church herself, of her own vital principles, of all that justifies her existence, that falsehood and unbelief should reign where everything should live and move and have its being in truth and faith! And yet the gravest danger is not that the evil has spread among the faithful, but that it has been legalized, that this state of affairs in the Church has been established by statute and that such an anomaly should be the inevitable outcome of the *standard* accepted by the State and by the whole of our society.[1]

"Generally speaking, among us in Russia, in Church affairs as in all other matters it is outward decorum that must be preserved at all costs; and with that our love for the Church, our idle love, our indolent faith, is satisfied. We readily shut our eyes and, in our childish fear of scandal, attempt to blind ourselves and everyone else to all that great evil which, under the veil of respectability, is eating like a cancer into the living core of our religious organism.[2] Nowhere else is truth regarded with such horror as in the domain of our Church administration; nowhere else is there greater servility than in our spiritual hierarchy; nowhere is the 'salutary falsehood' practiced on a larger scale than in the place where all falsehood should be held in detestation. Nowhere else are there admitted on grounds of policy so many compromises which lower the dignity of the Church and rob her of her authority. The root cause of it all is the lack of a sufficient faith in the power of truth.[3] And the most serious part of it is that, though we are aware of all these evils in our Church, we have come to terms with them and are content to live at peace. But such a shameful peace, such dishonorable compromise, can never promote the true peace of the Church; in the cause of truth it signifies defeat, if not betrayal.[4]

"Our Church, if we are to take the word of her champions, is a huge but wayward flock, shepherded by the officers of the law who with the lash force the straying sheep into the fold. Does such a picture correspond to the true conception of Christ's Church? If not, she is no longer the Church of Christ. What is she, then? A State institution which can be used in the interests of the State for moral discipline. But it must not be forgotten that the Church is a domain the moral basis of which admits of no change, a domain in which disloyalty to the very principle of her life cannot go unpunished, in which a lie is a lie not to men but to God. A Church that is unfaithful to Christ's covenant is the most barren and anomalous

[1] *ibid.,* p. 91.
[2] *ibid.,* p. 42
[3] *ibid.,* p. 35.
[4] *ibid.,* p. 43.

phenomenon in the world; she stands condemned already by the word of God.[1] A Church which is a department of State, that is, of a 'kingdom of this world,' has renounced her mission and will inevitably share the fate of all the kingdoms of this world.[2] She has no intrinsic reason for existence; she has doomed herself to impotence and death.[3]

"The Russian conscience is not free in Russia; religious thought remains paralyzed; the 'abomination of desolation' stands in the holy place; the breath of mortality banishes the life-giving Spirit; the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, is left to rust and its place is taken by the sword of the State, while in the Church's precincts are seen, not the angels of God watching over the faithful in their going out and coming in, but the officers of the law and inspectors of police — as guardians of Orthodoxy and directors of our consciences." [4]

We have not forgotten that the Slavophiles see in our Church the one true Church of Christ and the living synthesis of freedom and unity in the spirit of charity. And this is the conclusion reached by the latest representative of that party after an impartial enquiry into the state of the Church: "It is the spirit of truth, the spirit of charity, the spirit of life, the spirit of freedom, of whose invigorating breath the Church of Russia stands in need." [5]

Thus, according to the unimpeachable testimony of an eminent Russian Orthodox and patriot, our national Church has been deserted by the Spirit of Truth and Charity and is not the true Church of God. In order to escape from this inevitable conclusion, we have a habit of recalling for the moment the other Eastern Churches, to which otherwise we do not give a thought. We do not belong, we say, to the Russian Church, but to the Orthodox and Œcumenical Church of the East. It will be readily understood that the champions of the separated Eastern Church desire nothing better than the ascription to her of a real and positive unity. It remains to be seen whether she possesses this unity in any effective sense.

---

[1] *ibid.,* pp. 91, 92.
[2] *ibid.,* p. iii.
[3] *ibid.,* p. 93.
[4] *ibid.,* pp. 83, 84.
[5] *ibid.,* p. 127.

VIII

Relations between the Russian and Greek Churches.
Bulgaria and Serbia

THE Eastern Church is not a homogeneous body. Among the various nations of which it is composed, the two most important have given it their names; its official title is the Greco-Russian Church. This national dualism (which, it may be remarked in passing, is singularly reminiscent of the two feet of clay of which Archbishop Philaret speaks) suggests a concrete form in which to put the question of our ecclesiastical unity. We are concerned to discover what the real living bond is which unites the Russian and the Greek Churches and makes of them a single moral organism. We are told that the Russians and the Greeks possess a common faith and that that is the main thing. But we must enquire what is meant in this case by the word "faith" or "religion" *(vera).* True faith is that which possesses our whole soul and is seen to be the moving and guiding principle of our entire existence. The profession of one and the same abstract belief, having no influence upon conscience or life, constitutes no corporate bond and cannot truly unite anyone; it becomes a matter of indifference whether or not anyone possesses this dead faith in common with anyone else. On the other hand, unity in real faith inevitably becomes a living and active unity, a moral and practical solidarity.

If the Russian and Greek Churches give no evidence of their solidarity by any vital activity, their "unity of faith" is a mere abstract formula producing no fruits and involving no obligations. A layman interested in religious questions once asked that distinguished prelate, the metropolitan Philaret,[1] what could be done to revive the relations between the Russian Church and the Mother Church. "But on what grounds are relations between them possible?" was the reply of the author of the *Greco-Russian Catechism*. Some years before this curious conversation, there occurred an incident which gives us an insight into the truth of the words of the wise archbishop. William Palmer, a distinguished member of the Anglican Church and of the University of Oxford, wished to join the Orthodox Church. He went to Russia and Turkey to study the contemporary situation in the Christian East and to

[1] The reader must not be surprised to come across this name constantly in our writings; he is the only really notable character produced by the Russian Church in the nineteenth century.

find out on what conditions he would be admitted to the communion of the Eastern Orthodox. At St. Petersburg and at Moscow he was told that he had only to abjure the errors of Protestantism before a priest, who would thereupon administer to him the sacrament of Holy Chrism or Confirmation. But at Constantinople he found that he must be baptized afresh. As he knew himself to be a Christian and saw no reason to suspect the validity of his baptism (which incidentally was admitted without question by the Orthodox Russian Church), he considered that a second baptism would be a sacrilege. On the other hand, he could not bring himself to accept Orthodoxy according to the local rules of the Russian Church, since he would then become Orthodox only in Russia while remaining a heathen in the eyes of the Greeks; and he had no wish to join a national Church but to join the universal Orthodox Church. No one could solve his dilemma, and so he became a Roman Catholic.[1] It is obvious that there are questions on which the Russian Church could and ought to negotiate with the Mother See, and if these questions are carefully avoided it is because it is a foregone conclusion that a clear formulation of them would only end in a formal schism. The jealous hatred of the Greeks for the Russians, to which the latter reply with a hostility mingled with contempt — that is the fact which governs the real relations of these two national Churches, in spite of their being officially in communion with one another. But even this official unity hangs upon a single hair, and all the diplomacy of the clergy of St. Petersburg and Constantinople is needed to prevent the snapping of this slender thread. The will to maintain this counterfeit unity is decidedly not inspired by Christian charity, but by the dread of a fatal disclosure; for on the day on which the Russian and Greek Churches formally break with one another the whole world will see that the Ecumenical Eastern Church is a mere fiction and that there exists in the East nothing but isolated national Churches. That is the real motive which impels our hierarchy to adopt an attitude of caution and moderation towards the Greeks, in other words, to avoid any kind of dealings with them.[2] As for the Church of Constantinople, which in its arrogant provincialism assumes the title of "the Great Church" and "the Œcumenical Church," it would probably be glad to be rid of these Northern barbarians who are only a hindrance to its Pan-Hellenic aims. In recent times, the patriarchate of Constantinople has been twice

---

[1] A note at the end of this volume gives certain historical details on the question of second baptism in the Greco-Russian Church. These facts, with which no doubt Palmer was acquainted, could only confirm him in his final resolve not to seek universal truth in a quarter where the basic mystery of our religion has been made an instrument of national politics. [The note referred to is missing from all the editions of Solovyev's work which I have been able to consult. — Tr.]

[2] It is also the only practical reason for our still retaining the Julian calendar in defiance of the sun and the stars; no change could be made without entering into negotiations with the Greeks, which is just what our clerical circles most dread.

on the point of anathematizing the Russian Church;[1] only purely material considerations have prevented a split. The Greek Church of Jerusalem, which is in fact completely subservient to that of Constantinople, depends, on the other hand, for its means of subsistence almost entirely upon Russian charity. This material dependence of the Greek clergy on Russia is of very long standing, and does in fact form the only actual basis of Greco-Russian unity. But it is clear that this purely external link is incapable of fusing the two Churches into a single moral organism endowed with unity of life and action.

This conclusion will be further strengthened if we take into consideration the national Churches of lesser importance which, being under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople, were formerly part of the Greek Church, but became autocephalous as the various, small States regained their political independence. The relations of these so-called Churches to one another, to the metropolitan see of Byzantium and to the Russian Church, are almost non-existent. Even such purely official and conventional relations as are maintained between St. Petersburg and Constantinople are not, as far as I am aware, established between Russia and the new autocephalous Churches of Romania and Greece.

The case of Bulgaria and Serbia is worse still. It is well known that in 1872 the Greek patriarchs, with the consent of the Synod of Athens, excommunicated the whole Bulgarian people for reasons of national policy. The Bulgarians were condemned for their "phyletism," that is to say, their tendency to subject the Church to racial and national divisions. The accusation was true; but this phyletism, which was heresy among the Bulgarians, was orthodoxy itself among the Greeks. The Russian Church, while sympathizing with the Bulgarians, wished to rise above this political quarrel. But she could only do so by speaking in the name of the Universal Church, which she had no more right to do than the Greeks. The Synod of St. Petersburg, therefore, instead of making a clear pronouncement, merely sulked at the Byzantine hierarchy and, on receiving the decisions of the council of 1872 with a request for its approval, refrained from answering one way or the other. Hence arose a state of affairs which had never been foreseen or, rather, had been thought impossible, according to the canons of the Church. The Russian Church remained in formal communion with the Greek Church and in actual communion with the Bulgarian Church without any explicit protest against the canonical act of excommunication which separated these two Churches or any appeal, even if only for form's sake, to an œcumenical council.

A complication of the same kind rose with Serbia. The atheist government of this little kingdom promulgated ecclesiastical laws which established the hierarchy

---

[1] In 1872, when the Synod of St. Petersburg refused to associate itself openly with the decisions of the Greek council which excommunicated the Bulgarians; and in 1884, when the Russian Government requested the Porte to nominate two Bulgarian bishops in dioceses which the Greeks regard as entirely under their jurisdiction.

of the Serbian Church on a basis of compulsory simony, since all sacred offices were to be purchased at a fixed tariff; the metropolitan Michael and the other bishops were arbitrarily deposed and a new hierarchy was created in defiance of canon law. This hierarchy was formally repudiated by the Russian Church and replied by purchasing the support of the patriarch of Constantinople. It was now "the Great Church" which found herself in communion with two Churches which were out of communion with one another.

It need hardly be added that all these national Churches are simply State Churches entirely without any kind of ecclesiastical freedom. It is easy to imagine the disastrous effect which such an oppression of the Church can produce upon the religion of these unfortunate countries. The religious indifference of the Serbs is as well known as their mania for using Orthodoxy as a political weapon in their fratricidal struggle against the Catholic Croats.[1] As regards Bulgaria, Mgr. Joseph, the exarch of that country and a witness of unimpeachable authority, revealed the distressing state of religion among his people in an allocution delivered at Constantinople in 1885 on the feast of St. Methodius. "The mass of the people," he said, "are cold and indifferent, while the educated classes are definitely hostile to everything sacred; it is only fear of the Russians that prevents the abolition of the Church in Bulgaria." [2] There is no need for us to show that the religious condition of Romania and Greece is essentially the same as that of the Serbs and Bulgarians. In a report presented to the Emperor of Russia by the Procurator of the Holy Synod, and published last year, the religious and ecclesiastical condition of the four Orthodox countries of the Balkan peninsula is painted in the darkest colors. It could not, in fact, be worse. But what is really surprising is the explanation given in the official document. The one and only cause of all these evils, according to the ruler of our Church, is the constitutional regime! If that is so, then what is the cause of the deplorable state of the Church of Russia?

[1] For the views on this subject of a Slavophile writer who has lived long in Serbia, the reader is referred to the article by P. K—ky in Aksakov's periodical, *Russ* (1885, No. 12).
[2] This sermon was reproduced in full in Katkov's paper, the *Moscow Gazette.*

IX

The fulfillment of a prophecy. Cæsaropapism in action.

GEORGE Samarin,[1] a friend of Aksakov and like him a prominent member of the Slavophile party or group, in a letter on the subject of the Vatican Council wrote as follows: "Papal absolutism has not killed the vitality of the Catholic clergy; this should give us food for thought, for some day or other we shall hear promulgated the infallibility of the Tsar or rather that of the Procurator of the Holy Synod, for the Tsar is of comparatively no importance. . . . When that day comes, shall we find a single bishop, a single monk or a single priest who will protest? I doubt it. If anyone protests, it will be a layman, your obedient servant or Ivan Sergeyevich (Aksakov), if we are still in this world. As for our unfortunate clergy, whom you think deserving of pity rather than blame (and perhaps you are right), they will be dumb."

It was a happy chance that brought these words to my notice, for I know few prophecies of the kind which have been fulfilled so exactly to the letter. The proclamation of Cæsaropapist absolutism in Russia, the profound silence and absolute submission of the clergy, and finally the solitary protest of a single layman — it has all come about exactly as Samarin foresaw.

In 1885 an official document emanating from the Russian Government[2] declared that the Eastern Church had resigned its authority and placed it in the hands of the Tsar. Few people noticed this significant utterance. Samarin was already dead some years. Aksakov had only a few months to live; nevertheless, he published in his periodical *Russ* the protest of a lay writer who incidentally did not belong to the Slavophile group. This solitary protest, neither authorized nor supported by a single representative of the Church, only served by its isolation to throw into relief the deplorable state of religion in Russia.[3] Indeed, the Cæsaropapist manifesto of

[1] Yury (George) Fedorovich Samarin (d. 1876), an ardent disciple of Khomyakov, whose brilliant qualities he lacked, but whom he surpassed in learning and critical acumen, deserved well of Russia for the very active part he played in the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. Apart from that, his cultured intelligence and remarkable talent remained almost entirely unproductive, as so often happens in Russia. He left behind him no works of importance and as a writer chiefly distinguished himself by controversial writings against the Jesuits and the Germans of the Baltic provinces. The letter from which we quote was addressed to a Russian lady (Mme. A. O. Smirnov) and is dated 10/22 December 1871.

[2] Regulations for State examinations in the Faculty of Laws.

[3] *Note to Russian readers.* I did not sign the article in question ("State philosophy in the University curricula," *Russ,*

the officials of St. Petersburg was merely the explicit admission of an established fact. It is undeniably true that the Eastern Church has abdicated in favor of the secular power; the only question is whether it had the right to do so and whether, having done so, it could still represent Him to Whom all power has been given in Heaven and Earth. Whatever violence may be done to the Gospel passages concerning the eternal powers left by Jesus Christ to His Church, they will never yield any mention of the right of surrendering those powers into the hands of a temporal authority. The authority which claims to take over the Church's mission on Earth must have received at least the same promise of stability.

We do not believe that our prelates have willingly or deliberately surrendered their ecclesiastical authority. But if the Eastern Church has, in the course of events, lost that which once belonged to her by divine right, it is clear that the gates of Hell have prevailed against her and that therefore she is not the impregnable Church founded by Christ.

Nor do we wish to hold the secular government responsible for the anomalous relation of the Church to the State. The State has been justified in maintaining its independence and supremacy in regard to a spiritual authority which only represented one particular national Church in separation from the great Christian community. The declaration that the State should be subject to the Church can only refer to the one, indivisible and universal Church founded by God.

The government of a separated national Church is only a historical and purely human institution. But the Head of the State is the lawful representative of the nation as such, and a body of clergy which aims at being national and nothing more must, whether they like it or not, recognize the absolute sovereignty of the secular government. The sphere of national existence can include within itself only one single center, the Head of the State. The hierarchy of one particular Church can only claim to exercise over the State the sovereignty of apostolic authority in so far as it in fact forms the link between the nation and the universal, that is the international, Kingdom of Christ. A national Church that does not wish to be subject to the absolute authority of the State, that is to say, to surrender its existence as a Church and become a department of the civil administration, must needs possess a real *point d'appui* outside the confines of State and nation. With these it is connected by natural and historical ties; but as a Church it must belong to a wider social group with an independent center and a world-wide organization of which the local Church can only constitute a single individual member.

September 1885), because I believed myself to be expressing the general feelings of Russian society. This was an illusion and I can now assert my sole claim to this *vox clamantis in deserto.* But it must not be forgotten that besides what is called "society" there are in Russia twelve to fifteen million dissenters who did not wait for the year 1885 to make their protest against the Cæsaropapism of Moscow and St. Petersburg.

The leaders of the Russian Church could not rely on their religious metropolis in the struggle against the overpowering despotism of the State; for the Mother See was itself no more than a national Church which had been long subservient to the secular power. It is not ecclesiastical freedom but Cæsaropapism, which we have inherited from Byzantium, where this anti-Christian principle had developed unhindered ever since the ninth century. The Greek hierarchy, having repudiated the powerful support which it had possessed hitherto in the independent center of the Universal Church, found itself completely abandoned to the mercy of the State and its despot. Before the schism, each time that the Greek Emperors encroached upon the spiritual domain and threatened the freedom of the Church, her spokesmen — whether it was St. John Chrysostom, or St. Flavian, or St. Maximus the Confessor, or St. Theodore of the Studium, or the patriarch St. Ignatius — turned to the international center of Christendom and appealed to the judgment of the sovereign pontiff; and if they themselves fell victims to brute force, yet their cause, the cause of truth and justice and freedom, never failed to find at Rome a resolute champion who ensured its ultimate triumph. In those days the Greek Church was, and knew herself to be, a living part of the Universal Church, closely bound to the whole by the common center of unity, the apostolic Chair of Peter. This relation of salutary dependence upon a successor of the supreme Apostles, God's pontiff, this purely spiritual, lawful and honorable relation, gave place to a worldly, unlawful and humiliating subjection to the power of mere laymen and unbelievers.

This is not simply an accident of history; it is an instance of the logic of events, which inevitably robs any merely national Church of its independence and dignity and brings it under the yoke of the temporal power, a yoke which may be more or less oppressive but is always ignominious. In every country which has been brought to accept a national Church, the secular government, be it autocratic or constitutional, enjoys absolute authority; the ecclesiastical institution only figures as a special Ministry dependent on the general State administration. In such a case it is the national State which is the real complete entity, existing by itself and for itself; the Church is only a section, or rather a certain aspect, of this social organism of the body politic, only existing for itself in the abstract.

Such enslavement of the Church is incompatible with its spiritual dignity, its divine origin and its universal mission. On the other hand, reason demonstrates, and history confirms the conclusion, that it is absolutely impossible for two powers and two governments, equally sovereign and independent and confined to the same territory, to exist for long side by side within the bounds of a single national State. Such a dyarchy inevitably produces an antagonism which can only end in a complete triumph for the secular government since it is this which really represents

the nation, whereas the Church, by its very nature, is not a national institution and cannot become one without forfeiting the true reason for its existence.

We are told that the Emperor of Russia is a son of the Church. That is only what he should be as head of a Christian State. But if he is to be so in actual fact, then the Church must exercise an authority over him; she must possess a power that is independent and superior to that of the State. With the best will in the world the secular monarch cannot be truly the son of a Church of which he is at the same time the head and which he governs through his officials.

The Church in Russia, deprived of any *point d'appui* or center of unity outside the national State, has inevitably come to be subservient to the secular power; and the latter, acknowledging no authority upon Earth superior to itself, recognizing no one from whom it may receive religious sanction, that is to say, a partial delegation of the authority of Christ, has just as inevitably engendered an anti-Christian despotism.

If the national State asserts itself as a complete and self-sufficient social organism, it cannot belong as a living member to the universal body of Christ. And if it is outside that body, then it is not a Christian State and is only reviving the ancient Cæsarism which was abolished by Christianity.

God assumed manhood in the person of the Jewish Messiah at the moment when Man was assuming godhead in the person of the Roman Cæsar. Jesus Christ did not attack Cæsar or dispute his authority; He spoke the truth about him. He said that Cæsar was not God and that Cæsar's power was external to the Kingdom of God. The rendering to Cæsar of the money that he coins and to God of all the rest, that is what is called nowadays the separation of Church and State, a separation which is essential as long as Cæsar remains pagan, but impossible as soon as he becomes Christian. A Christian, be he king or emperor, cannot remain outside the Kingdom of God and set up his own authority against God's. The supreme commandment: "Render to God the things that are God's" is necessarily binding upon Cæsar himself if he would be a Christian. He too must render to God what is God's, and to God belongs, above all, supreme and absolute power upon Earth; for if we would understand the words about Cæsar which our Lord addressed to His enemies before His Passion, we must complete them with that other more solemn utterance after His Resurrection. To His disciples, the representatives of His Church, He said: "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on Earth' (Matt. xxviii. 18). This is an explicit and decisive passage which cannot honestly be interpreted in more than one way. Those who really believe in Christ's words will never recognize a State as an absolutely independent and sovereign temporal power, separate from the Kingdom of God. There is only one power upon Earth and that belongs not to Cæsar, but to Jesus Christ. The words about the tribute-money have already robbed Cæsar of his divinity; this new utterance robs him of his despotic

authority. If he wishes to reign upon Earth, he can no longer do so in his own right; he must receive his commission from Him to Whom all power is given upon Earth. How then is he to obtain this commission?

Jesus Christ, in revealing to men the Kingdom of God which is not of this world, gave them all the necessary means of realizing this Kingdom in the world. Having affirmed in His high-priestly prayer that the final aim of His work was the perfect unity of all, our Lord desired to provide an actual organic basis for this work by founding His visible Church and by giving it a single head in the person of St. Peter as the guarantee of its unity. If there is in the Gospels any delegation of authority, it is this. Jesus Christ gave no sanction or promise whatsoever to any temporal power. He founded only the Church, and He founded it on the monarchical power of Peter: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church."

The Christian State, therefore, must be dependent upon the Church founded by Christ, and the Church itself is dependent upon the head which Christ has given it. In a word, it is through Peter that the Christian Cæsar must share in the kingship of Christ. He can possess no authority apart from him who has received the fullness of all authority; he cannot reign apart from him who holds the keys of the Kingdom. The State, if it is to be Christian, must be subject to the Church of Christ; but if this subjection is to be genuine, the Church must be independent of the State, it must possess a center of unity outside and above the State, it must be in truth the Universal Church.

It has latterly begun to be realized in Russia that a merely national Church, left to its own resources, is bound to become a passive and worthless instrument of the State, and that ecclesiastical independence can only be ensured by an international center of spiritual authority. But while the necessity of such a center is admitted, attempts have been made to bring it into being within the boundaries of Eastern Christendom This plan to create an Eastern quasi-Pope is the last anti-Catholic ambition left for us to examine.

X

The design to establish a quasi-Papacy at Constantinople or Jerusalem

THIS preconceived determination that at all costs the center of the Universal Church shall be situated in the East indicates at the very outset a spirit of local egotism and racial hatred that is more likely to breed schism than to establish Christian unity. Would it not be better to put prejudice aside and look for the center of unity where it is actually to be found? If it is not to be found anywhere, it is surely childish to attempt to invent it.

Once it is granted that such a center is necessary to the normal life of the Church, it cannot be supposed that the divine Head and Founder of the Church did not foresee this necessity, or that He left the indispensable basis of His work to chance circumstances or human caprice. If facts compel us to admit that the Church cannot act freely without an international center of unity, we must also frankly confess that the Christian East has been deprived of this essential organ for the last thousand years and cannot therefore alone constitute the Universal Church. Surely, during so long a period the Universal Church must have manifested her unity elsewhere. That there is nothing serious or practical in this hybrid notion of finding a central government for the Universal Church somewhere in the East or of setting up an Eastern antipope is sufficiently shown by the inability of its advocates to agree on the following question, even when put as a mere theoretical plan or a pious aspiration: On which of the dignitaries of the Eastern Church is this uncertain task to devolve? Some are in favor of the "Œcumenical Patriarch" of Constantinople; others would prefer the see of Jerusalem, "the Mother of all the Churches." If we here attempt briefly to do justice to these pathetic utopias, it is not because of their intrinsic importance, which is absolutely nil, but simply out of regard for certain estimable writers who in desperation have sought to substitute these imaginary notions for the true ideal of the reunion of the Churches.

If the center of unity does not exist by divine right, then the Church of the present day (which they regard nevertheless as a complete organism) must create for herself, after a life of eighteen centuries, that upon which her very existence depends. It is as if a human body, all complete but for the brain, were to be expected to manufacture this central organ for itself. However, since the general

absurdity of the theory is not apparent to our opponents, we must go into their schemes in detail.

In conferring the primacy of jurisdiction upon one of her pastors, the Church may guide her choice either by the facts of religious history attested by ecclesiastical tradition or by purely political considerations. In order to lend an air of religious sanction to their national ambitions, the Greeks of Byzantium have asserted that their Church was founded by the apostle St. Andrew, to whom they give the title of *protokletos* (first-called). The legendary connection between this apostle and Constantinople, even if it were well established,[1] could not confer any ecclesiastical prerogative on the imperial city, since neither Holy Scripture nor the tradition of the Church attributes to St. Andrew any kind of primacy in the apostolic college. The apostle could hardly communicate to his Church a privilege which he did not possess himself; and at the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451 the Greek bishops, desiring to attribute to the see of Constantinople primacy in the East and second place in the Universal Church after the bishop of "Old Rome," carefully avoided any appeal to St. Andrew and based their proposal solely on the political eminence of the imperial city (βασιλευουσα πόλις). This argument, which is ultimately the only argument for the claims of Byzantium, cannot in fact justify them either in the past or in the future.[2] If the pre-eminence of the "ruling city" carries with it ecclesiastical primacy, then the ancient city of Rome, which no longer enjoyed this pre-eminence, should have forfeited her leading place in the Church. Yet so far was anyone from daring to question her position that it was to the Pope himself that the Greek bishops came with their humble request that he would deign to approve the conditional and partial primacy of the Byzantine patriarch. As far as the situation today is concerned, what is to be done if the primacy belongs by right to that patriarch who is installed at the residence of the Orthodox Emperor, seeing that there is neither Orthodox Emperor at Constantinople nor patriarch at St. Petersburg? Or supposing this difficulty were overcome and Constantinople became again the ruling city of the Orthodox world and the residence of an Eastern Emperor, whether Russian, Greek or Greco-Russian — still for the Church it would be merely a return to the Cæsaropapism of the Second Empire. We know as a fact that the usurped primacy of the imperial patriarch was fatal to the freedom and authority of the Church in the East. It is clear that those who would escape the Cæsaropapism of St. Petersburg by removing it to Constantinople are merely jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire.

[1] It was the town of Patras which was hallowed by the martyrdom of St. Andrew and had the honor of originally possessing his relics.

[2] We shall have to consider later this first great instance of Byzantine Cæsaropapism; in any case it has nothing to do with the infallible authority of the dogmatic decrees formulated by the Council.

Jerusalem, the hallowed center of the national theocracy of the Old Testament, has no claim to supremacy in the Universal Church of Christ. Tradition calls St. James the first bishop of Jerusalem. But St. James had no kind of primacy in the Apostolic Church any more than St. Andrew and could not therefore communicate any special privilege to his see. Besides, for a long time he had no successor. At the approach of Vespasian's legions, the Christians deserted the condemned city which, in the following century, lost even its name. At the time of its restoration under Constantine, the see of St. James was subordinate to the jurisdiction of the metropolitan archbishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, just as up to 381 the bishop of Byzantium was subordinate to the metropolitan of Heraclea in Thrace. Even after this, Jerusalem was for a long time a patriarchate only in name, and when she finally obtained independent jurisdiction she took the last place among patriarchal sees. Today the "Mother of all the Churches" is reduced to a coterie subservient to Phanariot phyletism and pursuing an exclusively national policy. If Jerusalem is to become the hierarchical center of the Universal Church, then the Pan-Hellenist clique must be dispossessed and a new order of things created *ex nihilo.* But even if such an achievement were within the bounds of possibility, it is obvious that it could only be brought about by Russia at the price of a definite rupture with the Greeks. And then what would become of the Universal Church for which Russia is to provide ready-made an independent center of authority? There would no longer exist a Greco-Russian Church; and the new patriarch of Jerusalem would be in reality only the patriarch of all the Russias. Certainly the Bulgarians and Serbs would do nothing to further the independence of the Church, and so we should have come back to a national Church with a hierarchy whose acknowledged leader could be no more than a mere subject and servant of the State.

The manifest impossibility of finding or creating in the East a center of unity for the Universal Church makes it imperative for us to seek it elsewhere. *First and foremost we must recognize ourselves for what we are in reality, an organic part of the great body of Christendom, and affirm our intimate solidarity with our Western brethren who possess the central organ which we lack. This moral act of justice and charity would be in itself an immense step forward on our part and the essential condition of all further advance.*

PART TWO

THE ECCLESIASTICAL MONARCHY FOUNDED BY JESUS CHRIST

ANDREW, Simon Peter's brother, was one of the two who had heard what John said and had followed Jesus. He first found his brother Simon and said to him: We have found the Messiah (which means, the Anointed). And he brought him to Jesus. Jesus having looked upon him said: Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas (which means, "Rock").

— (John 1. 40-42).

The Greco-Russian Church, as we have seen, claims the special patronage of St. Andrew. The blessed apostle, inspired by goodwill towards his brother, brings him to the Lord and hears from the divine lips the first word of Simon's future destiny as the Rock of the Church. There is no indication in the Gospels or in the Acts of the Apostles that St. Andrew ever felt any envy towards St. Peter or questioned his primacy. It is because we would justify the claim of Russia to be the Church of St. Andrew that we shall try to imitate his example and to conceive the same spirit of goodwill and religious harmony towards the great Church which is especially connected with St. Peter. This spirit will preserve us from local or national egotism, the source of so much error, and will enable us to examine the dogma of the Rock of the Church in the light of the very essence of the revelation of the God-Man, and so to discern in that revelation the eternal truths which this dogma expresses.

I

The Rock of the Church

IT would take too long to investigate here or even to enumerate all the existing doctrines and theories about the Church and its constitution. But anyone who is concerned to discover the plain truth about this fundamental problem of positive religion must be struck by the ease with which Providence has ordained that the truth may be learned. All Christians are in complete agreement on one point, namely that the Church was founded by Christ; the question is how and in what terms He founded it. Now, there is in the Gospels only one solitary text which mentions the founding of the Church in a direct, explicit and formal manner. This fundamental text becomes more and more clear as the Church itself grows and develops the permanent features of its organic structure; and nowadays the opponents of the truth can generally find no other way out but that of mutilating Christ's creative word in order to adapt it to their own sectarian standpoint.[1]

"Jesus Christ, having come into the district of Cæsarea Philippi, asked His disciples: Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? And they answered Him: Some say, John the Baptist; others, Elijah; others again, Jeremiah or one of the prophets. He said to them: And who do you say that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for it is not flesh and blood which have revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in Heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed in Heaven" (Matt. xvi. 13-19).

The union of the Divine and the human, which is the goal of creation, was accomplished individually (or hypostatically) in the unique person of Jesus Christ, "perfect God and perfect Man, uniting the two natures in a perfect manner without confusion and without division."[2] The historic work of God enters henceforward upon a new stage. It is no longer a matter of a physical and individual unity, but of a moral and social union. The God-Man desires to unite humanity with Himself in a perfect union. The human race is steeped in error and sin. How shall He set about it? Is He to approach each human soul separately and unite it to Himself by a

[1] Thus the text in question is mutilated even in the *Orthodox Catechism* of Mgr. Philaret of Moscow.
[2] Formula of Pope St. Leo the Great and of the Council of Chalcedon.

purely interior and subjective bond? He answers, No: Οικοδομήσω την εκκλησίαν μου. “I will build My Church.” It is a real objective work of which we are here told. But will He allow this work to be subject to all the divisions natural to the human race? Will He unite Himself to individual nations as such by giving them independent national Churches? No, He does not say: I will build My Churches, but: My Church, την εκκλησίαν μου. Mankind united to God must form a single social structure and for this unity a solid basis must be found.

Any genuine union is based on the mutual interaction of those who are united. The act of absolute truth which is revealed in the God-Man (or the perfect Man) must meet with the response of imperfect humanity in an act of irrevocable adherence which links us to the divine principle. God incarnate does not desire that His truth should be accepted in a passive and servile spirit. In His new dispensation He asks of mankind a free act of recognition. But at the same time this free act must be absolutely true and infallible. Therefore, there must be established in the midst of fallen humanity a single, fixed and impregnable point on which the constructive activity of God may be directly based, a point at which human freedom shall coincide with divine Truth in a composite act absolutely human in its outward form, but divinely infallible in its fundamental character.

In the creation of the individual physical humanity of Christ the act of the divine Omnipotence required for its realization only the supremely passive and receptive self-surrender of feminine nature in the person of the Immaculate Virgin. The building up of the social or collective humanity of Christ, of His universal body, the Church, demands less and at the same time more than that: less, because the human foundation of the Church need not be represented by an absolutely pure and sinless individual, since there is no question in this case of creating a substantial and individual relation, or a hypostatic and complete union, between two natures, but simply of forging a living moral bond. If, however, this new link (the link between Christ and the Church) is less intimate and fundamental than the previous link (that between the Word of God and human nature in the womb of the Immaculate Virgin), it is humanly speaking more positive, and of more far-reaching influence: more positive, because this new bond between the Spirit and the Truth demands a virile will to respond to God’s revelation and a virile intelligence to give a definite form to the truth which it accepts; moreover, this new link is of wider scope because, forming as it does the creative foundation of a collective entity, it cannot be confined to a personal relationship but must be extended through time as a permanent function of the society so formed.

It was necessary, therefore, to find in mankind as it is such a center of active coherence between the Divine and the human, which might form the base or rock-foundation of the Christian Church. Jesus in His supernatural foreknowledge had already pointed out this rock. But in order to show us that His choice was free from

all suspicion of arbitrariness, He begins by seeking elsewhere the human response to revealed truth. He turns first of all to general public opinion; He wishes to see whether He cannot be recognized, accepted and acclaimed by the opinion of the mob, the voice of the people: *Quem dicunt homines esse Filium Hominis?* For whom do men take Me? But Truth is ever one and the same, whereas the opinions of men are many and conflicting. The voice of the people, which some claim to be the voice of God, only answered the question of the God-Man with its own erroneous and discordant opinions. There is no bond possible between Truth and such errors; mankind cannot enter into relation with God by the way of popular opinion; the Church of Christ cannot be founded on democracy.

Having questioned popular opinion and failed to find there man's response to divine truth, Jesus Christ turns to His chosen, the college of the Apostles, that first of all œcumenical councils: *Vos autem quem me esse dicitis?* And for whom do you take Me? But the Apostles are silent. The moment before, when asked for the opinions of men, the twelve all spoke together: why do they leave the word to one of their number when it is a question of asserting divine truth? Possibly they are not quite agreed among themselves; possibly Philip does not perceive the essential relation of Jesus to the heavenly Father; possibly Thomas is doubtful of the Messianic power of his Master. The last chapter of St. Matthew tells us that even on the Galilean mountain, whither they were summoned by Jesus after His resurrection, the Apostles did not show themselves unanimous and firm in their faith: *quidam autem dubitaverunt* (Matt. xxviii. 17).

If it is to bear unanimous witness to the pure and simple truth, the council must be in absolute agreement. The decisive act must be an entirely individual act, the act of a single person. It is neither the multitude of the faithful nor the apostolic council, but Simon Bar-Jona alone who answers Jesus. *Respondens Simon Petrus dixit: Tu es Filius Dei vivi.* He replies for all the Apostles, but he speaks on his own responsibility without consulting them or waiting for their consent. When the Apostles had repeated, a moment before, the opinions of the crowd which followed Jesus, they had only repeated what were errors; if Simon had only wished to voice the opinions of the Apostles, he would possibly not have reached the pure and simple truth. But he followed his own spiritual impulse, the voice of his own conscience; and Jesus, in pronouncing His solemn approval, declared that this impulse, for all its individual character, came nevertheless from His heavenly Father, that it was an act both divine and human, a real co-operation between the absolute Being and the relative subject.

The fixed point, the impregnable rock, has been discovered whereon to base the divine-human activity. The organic foundation of the universal Church is found in a single man who, with the divine assistance, answers for the whole world. It is fixed neither upon the impossible unanimity of all believers, nor upon the

inevitably hazardous agreement of a council, but upon the real and living unity of the prince of the Apostles. And henceforward every time that the question of truth is put to Christian humanity, it will not be from the voice of the masses nor from the opinion of the elect that the fixed and final answer will come. The arbitrary opinions of men will only give rise to heresies; and the hierarchy separated from its center and abandoned to the mercy of the secular power will refrain from speaking or will speak through such councils as the robber-council of Ephesus. Only in union with the rock on which it is founded will the Church be able to assemble true councils and define the truth by authoritative formulas. This is no mere opinion; it is a historic fact of such impressiveness that on the most solemn occasions it has been averred by the Eastern bishops themselves for all their jealousy of the successors of St. Peter. Not only was the wonderful dogmatic treatise of Pope St. Leo the Great recognized by the Greek Fathers of the fourth œcumenical Council as a work of Peter, but it was also to Peter that the sixth Council attributed the letter of Pope Agatho, who was far from having the same personal authority that Leo had. "The head and prince of the Apostles," declared the Eastern Fathers, "fought with us . . . The ink (of the letter) was plain to see and Peter spoke through Agatho (Και μέλαν εφαίνετο, και δι Αγαθνος ό Πέτρος εφθέγετο).[1]

Otherwise, if apart from Peter the universal Church can expressly declare the truth, how are we to explain the remarkable silence of the Eastern episcopate (notwithstanding that they have kept the apostolic succession) since their separation from the Chair of St. Peter? Can it be merely an accident? An accident lasting for a thousand years! To those anti-Catholics who will not see that their particularism cuts them off from the life of the universal Church, we have only one suggestion to make: Let them summon, without the concurrence of the successor of St. Peter, a council which they themselves can recognize as œcumenical! Then only will there be an opportunity of discovering whether they are right.

Wherever Peter does not speak, it is only the opinions of men that find utterance — and the Apostles are silent. But Jesus Christ did not commend the vague and contradictory opinions of the mob nor the silence of His chosen disciples; it was the unwavering, decisive and authoritative utterance of Simon Bar-Jona upon which He set the seal of His approval. Clearly this utterance, which satisfied our Lord, needed no human ratification; it possessed absolute validity *etiam sine consensu Ecclesiae.*[2] It was not by means of a general consultation but (as Jesus Christ Himself bore witness) with the direct assistance of the heavenly Father that Peter formulated the fundamental dogma of our religion; and his word defined the

[1] Mansi, *Concil.* xi. 658.
[2] "Even without the consent of the Church," the formula of the last Council, that of the Vatican.

faith of Christians by its own inherent power, not by the consent of others — *ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ.*

In contrast to the uncertain opinions of men, the word of Peter represents the stability and unity of the true faith; in contrast to the narrow national ideas of the Messiah to which the Apostles gave utterance, his word expresses the Messianic idea in its absolute and universal form. The idea of the Messiah which had sprung from the soil of Jewish national consciousness is already, in the visions of the post-exilic prophets, growing too large for these limits. But the true meaning of these mysterious and enigmatic visions was hardly divined by the inspired writers themselves, while Jewish public opinion remained exclusively nationalistic and could see no more in Christ than a great national prophet such as Elijah, Jeremiah, or John the Baptist, or at the most an all-powerful dictator, liberator and leader of the chosen people, such as Moses or David. This was the highest idea which the mob which followed Jesus held of Him; and we know that even His chosen disciples shared these popular notions up to the end of His earthly life (Luke xxiv. 19-21). Only in Peter's confession does the Messianic idea emerge freed from all its nationalistic trappings and invested for the first time in its final and universal form. "Thou art the Christ, Son of the living God." Here is no question of a national king or prophet; the Messiah is not a second Moses or David. Henceforward he bears the unique name of Him Who, though He is the God of Israel, is none the less the God of all the nations.

Peter's confession transcended Jewish nationalism and inaugurated the Universal Church of the New Covenant. This is yet one more reason why Peter should be the foundation of Christendom and why the supreme hierarchical authority, which of itself has ever maintained the universal or international character of the Church, should be the true heir of Peter and the actual possessor of all those privileges conferred by Christ upon the prince of the Apostles.

II

The primacy of St. Peter as a permanent institution.
The three Rocks of Christendom.

AND I say to thee that thou art Peter . . . " Of the three attributes represented in this crucial passage as belonging by divine right to the prince of the Apostles — (1) the call to be the foundation of the Church by the infallible confession of the truth, (2) the possession of the power of the keys, (3) the power of binding and loosing — it is only the last that he shares with the other Apostles. All Orthodox Christians[1] are agreed that the apostolic power of binding and loosing was not conferred upon the Twelve as private individuals or in the sense of a temporary privilege, but that it is the genuine source and origin of a perpetual priestly authority which has descended from the Apostles to their successors in the hierarchy, the bishops and priests of the Universal Church. But if this is true, then neither can the two former attributes connected particularly with St. Peter in a still more solemn and significant manner be individual or accidental prerogatives;[2] the less so, in that it was with the first of these prerogatives that our Lord expressly connected the permanence and stability of His Church in its future struggle against the powers of evil.

If the power of binding and loosing conferred on the Apostles is not a mere metaphor nor a purely personal and temporary attribute, if it is, on the contrary, the actual living germ of a universal permanent institution comprising the Church's whole existence, how can St. Peter's own special prerogatives, announced in such explicit and solemn terms, be regarded as barren metaphors or as personal and transitory privileges? Ought not they also to refer to some fundamental and permanent institution, of which the historic personality of Simon Bar-Jona is but the outstanding and typical representative? The God-Man did not establish ephemeral institutions. In His chosen disciples He saw, through and beyond all that was mortal and individual, the enduring principles and types of His work. What He said to the college of the Apostles included the whole priestly order, the teaching

[1] And, among non-Orthodox, all writers who are in good faith; for instance, the eminent Jewish thinker Joseph Salvador in his book *Jesus-Christ et son œuvre*.
[2] This conclusion is wholeheartedly accepted by the notable Jewish writer already referred to. He sees in the primacy of Peter the keystone of the edifice of the Church as designed and founded by Christ Himself.

Church in its entirety. The sublime words which He addressed to Peter alone created in the person of this one Apostle the undivided sovereign authority possessed by the Universal Church throughout the whole of its life and development in future ages. The fact that Christ did not see fit to make the formal foundation of His Church and the guarantee of its permanence dependent on the common authority of all the Apostles (for He did not say to the apostolic college: "On you I will build My Church") surely goes to show that our Lord did not regard the episcopal and priestly order, represented by the Apostles in common, as sufficient in itself to form the impregnable foundation of the Universal Church in her inevitable struggle against the gates of Hell. In founding His visible Church, Jesus was thinking primarily of the struggle against evil; and in order to ensure for His creation that unity which is strength, He crowned the hierarchy with a single, central institution, absolutely indivisible and independent, possessing in its own right the fullness of authority and of promise: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church: and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

All arguments in support of the supreme central authority of the Universal Church would, in our view, have but little weight if they were only arguments. But they rest upon a divine-human fact which remains essential to the Christian faith despite all the artificial interpretations by which men have attempted to suppress it. It is not for us to demonstrate the abstract necessity of an institution to which Christ has given a living actuality. The arguments of Eastern theologians demonstrating that the whole hierarchical system is essential to the Church would not suffice to convince us, were it not for the original fact recorded in the Gospels, namely, the choice of the twelve Apostles to teach all nations to the end of time. Similarly, when we wish to prove that an indivisible center is essential to this same hierarchy, it is the fact of the special choice of Peter to serve as a human *point d'appui* for the divine truth in its constant struggle against the gates of Hell — it is the fact of this unique choice which provides a firm foundation for all our arguments.

If "the Church" is taken to mean the perfect union of mankind with God, the absolute reign of love and truth, then there is no place in the Church for any power or authority. All the members of this heavenly Kingdom are priests and kings and, as such, equal with one another, and the one and only center of unity is Jesus Christ Himself. But it is not in this sense that we speak of the Church, for it is not in this sense that Christ spoke of it. The perfect Church, the Church triumphant, the kingdom of glory — all this implies that the power of evil and the gates of Hell are finally vanquished, and yet it is to contend with the gates of Hell that Christ builds His visible Church and gives it a center of unity which is human and earthly, though always divinely assisted.

If we would avoid the two opposite pitfalls of blind materialism and ineffectual idealism, we must admit that the needs of actual existence and the demands of the ideal coincide and harmonize in the order established by God. In order to show forth in the Church the ideal of harmony among men, Jesus Christ founded as the prototype of conciliar government the college or original council of the twelve Apostles, equal with one another and united by brotherly love. In order that this ideal unity might be effectually realized in every age and place, that the council of the hierarchy might always and everywhere prevail over discord and gather up the multiplicity of private opinions into uniform public decrees, that discussion might issue in the living manifestation of the unity of the Church, secure from the hazards to which the assemblies of men are exposed — in a word, that His Church might not be built upon shifting sands, the divine Architect revealed the firm impregnable Rock of ecclesiastical monarchy and set up the ideal of unanimity while basing it upon an actual living authority.

Christ, we are told, is the Rock of the Church. That is true; no Christian has ever disputed it. But it is hard to see the reasonableness, even if we admit the sincerity, of those who in their zeal to defend Christ from an imaginary insult persist in ignoring His express will and in repudiating the order which He established in so explicit a manner. For He not only declared that Simon, one of His Apostles, was the Rock of His Church, but in order to impress this new truth more forcibly upon us and to make it more evident and striking, He gave to Simon a distinctive and permanent name derived from this very call to be the Rock of the Church.

We have here, then, two equally indisputable truths: Christ is the Rock of the Church, and Simon Bar-Jona is the Rock of the Church. But the contradiction, if there be one, does not stop here. For we find this very Simon Peter, despite the fact that he alone received from Christ this unique prerogative, declaring in one of his epistles that all the faithful are living stones in the divine-human building (1 Pet. ii. 4, 5). Jesus is the one and only Rock of the Church; but, if we are to believe Jesus, the prince of the Apostles is the Rock of His Church *par excellence;* and again, if we would believe Peter, every true believer is the Rock of the Church.

Confronted with the apparent inconsistency of these truths, it is enough for us to observe their actual agreement in logic. Jesus Christ, the unique Rock of the Kingdom of God on the purely religious and mystical plane, sets up the prince of the Apostles and his permanent authority as the fundamental Rock of the Church in the social order for the Christian community; and each member of this community, united to Christ and abiding in the order established by Him, becomes an organic individual element, a living stone of this Church whose mystical and (for the time being) invisible foundation is Jesus Christ, and whose social and visible foundation is the monarchical power of Peter. The essential distinction between these three factors only serves to throw into stronger relief the intimate connection between

them in the Church's actual existence, in which Christ, Peter, and the multitude of the faithful each play an essential part. The notion of such a threefold relationship can appear inconsistent only to those who presuppose such inconsistency by interpreting the three fundamental factors in an absolute and exclusive sense which is entirely inappropriate to them. What they forget is that the expression "rock (*i. e.,* foundation) of the Church" is a relative expression, and that Christ can only be the Rock of the Church in that definite union of Himself with mankind which forms the Church; and since this union is primarily brought about in the social order through a central point of contact which Christ Himself associated with St. Peter, it is obvious that these two Rocks — the Messiah and His chief Apostle — so far from being mutually exclusive, are simply two inseparable factors in a unique relationship. As regards the rock or stones of the third order — the multitude of the faithful — though it is said that each believer may become a living stone of the Church, it is not said that he may do so by himself or in separation from Christ and the fundamental authority set up by Him.

The foundation of the Church, speaking in general terms, is the union of the Divine and the human. This foundation (the Rock) we find in Jesus Christ inasmuch as He unites the Godhead hypostatically with sinless human nature; we find it also in every true Christian inasmuch as he is united to Christ by the sacraments, by faith and by good works. But is it not clear that these two modes of union between the Divine and the human (the hypostatic union in the person of Christ, and the individual union of the believer with Christ) are not in themselves sufficient to constitute the specific unity of the Church in the strict sense of the word — that is, as a social and historic entity? The incarnation of the Word is a mystical fact and not a social principle; nor does the individual religious life provide an adequate basis for Christian society; man may remain alone in the desert and live a life of holiness. And yet, if, in the Church, besides the mystical life and the individual life, there exists the social life, this social life must have a definite form based upon a unifying principle peculiar to itself. When we maintain that this specific principle of social unity in the Church is in the first place neither Jesus Christ nor the mass of the faithful, but the monarchical authority of Peter, by means of which Jesus Christ has willed to unite Himself to man as a social and political being, we find our opinion confirmed by the remarkable fact that only in the case of the prince of the Apostles has the attribute of being the Rock of the Church carried with it the title to a distinctive and permanent name. He alone is the Rock of the Church in the special and strict sense of the term, that is to say, the unifying basis of the historic Christian society.

Three times only in the whole of sacred history recorded in the two Testaments did it happen that the Lord Himself changed a man's name. When Abraham by an act of unlimited faith vowed himself to the living God, God changed his name and

pronounced him to be the father of all believers ("father of the multitude"). When Jacob in that mysterious struggle pitted the whole spiritual energy of man against the living God, God gave him a new name which marked him out as the direct parent of that peculiar and unique race which has striven and still strives with its God. When Simon Bar-Jona, the descendant of Abraham and Jacob, combined in himself the powerful initiative of the human soul and the infallible assistance of the heavenly Father in the affirmation of the divine-human truth, the God-Man changed his name and set him at the head of the new believers and the new Israel. Abraham, the type of primitive theocracy, represents humanity in devotion and self-surrender to God; Jacob, the type of the national theocracy of the Jews, represents humanity beginning its struggle with God; and lastly Simon Peter, the type of universal and final theocracy, represents humanity making its response to its God, freely avowing Him and cleaving to Him in mutual and indissoluble adherence. That boundless faith in God which made Abraham the father of all believers was in Peter united to that active assertion of the power of man which distinguished Jacob-Israel; the prince of the Apostles reflected in the earthly mirror of his soul that harmony between the Divine and the human which he saw brought to perfection in his Master; and he became thereby the first-born and principal heir of the God-Man, the spiritual father of the new Christian race, the foundation-stone of that Universal Church which is the fulfilment and perfection of the religion of Abraham and of the theocracy of Israel.

III

"Peter" and "Satan"

IT was not Simon's apostleship that involved his change of name, for the change, though already predicted, was not made at the time of the choice and solemn sending forth of the Twelve. All with the single exception of Simon retained their own names in the apostleship; none of them received from our Lord a new and permanent title of wider or higher significance.[1]

Apart from Simon, all the Apostles are distinguished from one another solely by their natural characteristics, their individual qualities and destinies as well as by the varieties and shades of personal feeling shown towards them by their Master. On the other hand, the new and significant name which Simon alone receives in addition to the apostleship shared by all, indicates no natural trait in his character, no personal affection felt for him by our Lord, but refers solely to the special place which the son of Jona is called to fill in the Church of Christ. Our Lord did not say to him: Thou art Peter because I prefer thee to the others, or because by nature thou hast a firm and stable character (which, incidentally, would hardly have been borne out by the facts), but: Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church.

Peter's confession, which by a spontaneous and infallible act of allegiance established the bond between mankind and Christ and founded the free Church of the New Covenant, was not just a piece of characteristic behavior on his part. Nor can it have been a casual and momentary spiritual impulse. For is it conceivable that such an impulse or moment of enthusiasm should involve not merely a change of name for Simon as for Abraham and Jacob in times past, but also the prediction of that change long previously as something which would infallibly come about and which held a prominent place in our Lord's plans? Was there in fact any part of the work of the Messiah more solemn than the foundation of the Universal Church which is expressly connected with Simon under his new name of Peter? Moreover, the notion that the first dogmatic decree of St. Peter came from him merely in his capacity as an individual human being is totally excluded by the direct and explicit witness of Christ: It is not flesh and blood which have revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in Heaven.

[1] I am not speaking of surnames or of casual, incidental epithets such as that of Boanerges, given to John and James.

This confession of Peter's is, then, an act *sui generis,* an act whereby the moral being of the Apostle entered into a special relationship with the Godhead; it was this relationship which enabled human utterance to declare infallibly the absolute truth of the Word of God and to create an impregnable foundation for the Universal Church. And as though to remove all possible doubt on the subject, the inspired record of the Gospel at once goes on to show us this very Simon, whom Jesus has just declared to be the Rock of the Church and the key-bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven, forthwith left to his own resources and speaking — with the best intentions in the world, no doubt, but without the divine assistance — under the influence of his own individual and uninspired personality. "And thereafter Jesus began to show His disciples that He must needs go to Jerusalem and suffer much at the hands of the elders and the scribes and the chief priests and be put to death and rise again the third day. And Peter, taking Him aside, began to rebuke Him, saying: Far be it from Thee, Lord; this shall not happen unto Thee. And turning about He said to Peter: Get thee behind Me, Satan, thou art an offence unto Me, for thou understandest not that which is of God, but that which is of men" (Matt. xvi. 21-23).

Are we to follow our Greco-Russian controversialists in placing this text in opposition to the one before it and so make Christ's words cancel one another out? Are we to believe that the incarnate Truth changed His mind so quickly and revoked in a moment what He had only just announced? And yet, on the other hand, how are we to reconcile "Blessed" and "Satan" ? How is it conceivable that he who is for our Lord Himself a "rock of offence" should yet be the Rock of His Church which the gates of Hell cannot shake? Or that one who thinks only the thoughts of men can receive the revelation of the heavenly Father and can hold the keys of the Kingdom of God?

There is only one way to harmonize these passages which the inspired Evangelist has, with good reason, placed side by side. Simon Peter as supreme pastor and doctor of the Universal Church, assisted by God and speaking in the name of all, is the faithful witness and infallible exponent of divine-human truth; as such he is the impregnable foundation of the house of God and the key-bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven. The same Simon Peter as a private individual, speaking and acting by his natural powers and merely human intelligence, may say and do things that are unworthy, scandalous and even diabolical. But the failures and sins of the individual are ephemeral, while the social function of the ecclesiastical monarch is permanent. "Satan" and the "offence" have vanished, but Peter has remained.

IV

The Church as a universal society. The principle of love

SINCE the existence of every human society is determined by its ideals and institutions, it follows that social progress and well-being depend primarily on the truth of the predominant ideals of the society and on the good order which prevails in its administration. The Church, as a society directly willed and founded by God, must possess these two qualities to an outstanding degree: the religious ideals which she professes must be infallibly true; and her constitution must combine the greatest stability with the greatest capacity for action in any direction desired.

The Church is, above all, a society founded on Truth. The basic truth of the Church is the union of the Divine and the human in the Word made Flesh, the recognition of the Son of Man as the Christ, the Son of the living God. Therefore, in its purely objective aspect, the Rock of the Church is Christ Himself, Truth incarnate. But if she is to be actually founded on the truth, the Church as a human society must be united to this truth in a definite manner.

Since in this world of appearances truth has no existence which is directly manifest or externally necessary, man can only establish contact with it through faith which links us to the interior substance of things and presents to our intelligence all that is not externally visible. From the subjective point of view, then, it may be asserted that it is faith which constitutes the basis or "rock" of the Church. But what faith, and on whose part? The mere fact of a subjective faith on the part of such and such a person is not sufficient. Individual faith of the strongest and most sincere kind may put us in touch not only with the invisible substance of Truth and the Sovereign Good, but also with the invisible substance of evil and falsehood, as is abundantly proved by the history of religion. If man is to be truly linked by faith to the desirable object of faith, namely, absolute truth, he must be conformed to this truth.

The truth of the God-Man, that is to say, the perfect and living union of the Absolute and the relative, of the Infinite and the finite, of the Creator and the creature — this supreme truth cannot be limited to a historic fact, but reveals through that fact a universal principle which contains all the riches of wisdom and embraces all in its unity.

Since the objective truth of faith is universal and the true subject of faith must be conformed to its object, it follows that the subject of true religion is necessarily universal. Real faith cannot belong to man as an isolated individual, but only to mankind as a complete unity; and the individual can only share in it as a living member of the universal body. But since no real and living unity has been bestowed on the human race in the physical order, it must be created in the moral order. The limits of natural egoism, of finite individuality with its exclusive self-assertion, must be burst by love which renders man conformable to God, Who is Love. But this love which is to transform the discordant fragments of the human race into a real and living unity, the Universal Church, cannot be a mere vague, subjective and ineffectual sentiment; it must be translated into a consistent and definite activity which shall give the inner sentiment its objective reality. What, then, is the actual object of this active love? Natural love, which has for its object those beings who are nearest to us, creates a real collective unity, the family; the wider natural love which has for its object all the people of one country or one tongue creates a more extensive and more complex, but equally real, collective unity, the city, state or nation.[1] The love which is to create the religious unity of the human race, or the Universal Church, must surpass the bounds of nationality and have for its object the sum total of mankind. But since the active relationship between the sum total of the human race and the individual finds no basis in the latter in any natural sentiment analogous to that which animates the family or the fatherland, it is (for the individual subject) inevitably reduced to the purely moral essence of love, that is, to the free and conscious surrender of the will and the individual egoism of family or nation. Love for one's family or for one's country are primarily natural facts which may secondarily produce moral acts; love for the Church is essentially a moral act, the act of submitting the particular will to the universal will. But the universal will, if it is to be anything more than a fiction, must be continually realized in a definite being. The will of all humanity is not a real unity, since all men are not in direct agreement with one another; some means of harmonizing them must therefore be found, that is to say, one single will capable of unifying all the others. Each individual must be able to unite himself effectively with the whole of the human race (and thus give positive witness to his love for the Church) by linking his will to a unique will, no less real and living than his own, but at the same time a will which is universal and to which all other wills must be equally subject. But a will is inconceivable apart from one who wills and expresses his will; and inasmuch as all are not directly one, we have no choice

[1] The fact of dwelling in the same country or speaking a common language is not sufficient in itself to produce the unity of the fatherland; that is impossible without patriotism, that is to say, without a specific love.

but to unite ourselves to all in the person of one individual if we would share in the true universal faith.

Since each individual man cannot be the proper subject of universal faith any more than can the whole of mankind in its natural state of division, it follows that this faith must be manifested in a single individual, representative of the unity of all. Each individual, by taking this truly universal faith as the criterion of his own faith, makes a real act of submission to, or love for, the Church, an act which makes him conformable to the universal truth revealed to the Church. In loving all in one individual (since it is impossible to love them otherwise), each one shares in the faith of all, defined by the divinely assisted faith of a single individual; and this enduring bond, this unity so wide and yet so stable, so living and yet so unchanging, makes the Universal Church a collective moral entity, a true society far more extensive and more complex, but no less real, than nation or state. Love for the Church is manifested in a constant adherence to her will and her living thought represented by the public acts of the supreme ecclesiastical authority. This love which is originally nothing but an act of pure morality, the fulfilment of a duty on principle (obedience to the categorical imperative, according to the Kantian terminology) can and must become the source of sentiments and affections no less strong than filial love or patriotism. Those who agree with us in founding the Church upon love and yet see world-wide ecclesiastical unity only in a fossilized tradition which for eleven centuries has lost all means of actual self-expression, should bear in mind that it is impossible to love with a living and active love what is simply an archæological relic, a remote fact, such as the seven œcumenical councils, which is absolutely unknown to the masses and can only appeal to the learned. Love for the Church has no real meaning except for those who recognize perpetually in the Church a living representative and a common father of all the faithful, capable of being loved as a father is loved in his family or the head of the state in a kingdom.

It is of the nature of truth to draw into a harmonious unity the manifold elements of reality. This formal characteristic belongs to the supreme truth, the truth of the God-Man, which embraces in its absolute unity all the fullness of divine and human life. The Church, which is a collective being aspiring to perfect unity, must correspond to Christ, the one Being and Center of all beings. And inasmuch as this interior and perfect unity of all is not realized, inasmuch as the faith of each individual is not yet in itself the faith of all, inasmuch as the unity of all is not directly manifested by each, it must be brought about by means of a single individual.

The universal truth perfectly realized in the single person of Christ draws to itself the faith of all, infallibly defined by the voice of a single individual, the Pope. Outside this unity, as we have seen, the opinion of the masses may be mistaken and

the faith even of the elect may remain in suspense. But it is neither false opinion nor a vacillating faith, but a definite and infallible faith, which unites mankind to the divine truth and forms the impregnable foundation of the Universal Church. This foundation is the faith of Peter living in his successors, a faith which is personal that it may be manifest to men, and which is (by divine assistance) superhuman that it may be infallible. We shall not cease to challenge those who deny the necessity of such a permanent center of unity to point to any living unity in the Universal Church apart from it, to produce apart from it a single ecclesiastical act which concerns the whole of Christendom, or to give without appealing to it a decisive and authoritative reply to a single one of the questions which divide the consciences of Christians. It is, of course, obvious that the present successors of the Apostles at Constantinople or at St. Petersburg are imitating the silence of the Apostles themselves at Cæsarea Philippi.

To summarize shortly the foregoing reflections: The Universal Church is founded on truth affirmed by faith. Truth being one, true faith must be one also. And since this unity of faith has no present and immediate existence among the whole mass of believers (for in religious matters all are not unanimous), it must reside in the lawful authority of a single head, guaranteed by divine assistance and accepted by the love and confidence of all the faithful. That is the rock on which Christ has founded His Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

V

The keys of the Kingdom

IT seems as if Jesus wished to leave no possible doubt as to the intent and bearing of His words regarding the rock of the Church. He therefore completed them by explicitly committing the power of the keys and the supreme government of His Kingdom to that fundamental authority of the Church which He established in the person of Simon Peter. "And I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." And here we must first of all clear up a contradiction which our "orthodox" controversialists ascribe to Jesus Christ. In order to eliminate as far as possible the distinction between Peter and the other Apostles, it is asserted that the power of the keys is nothing else but the power of binding and loosing; after saying, "I will give thee the keys," Jesus is supposed to have repeated the same promise in other words. But in speaking of keys, the words "shut" and "open" should have been used, and not "bind" and "loose," as in fact (to confine ourselves solely to the New Testament) we read in the Apocalypse: Ό εχων τεν κλειδα του Δαυέιδ, ό ανοίγων και ουδεις κλείει, και κλείει και ουδεις ανοίγει. (He who has the key of David, who opens and no one shuts, and shuts and no one opens — Apoc. iii. 7.) A room, a house or a city may be shut and opened, but only particular beings or objects situated within the room or house or city can be bound and unbound. The Gospel passage in question is a metaphor, but a metaphor is not necessarily an absurdity. The symbol of the keys of the Kingdom (of the royal dwelling — *beth-ha-melek*) must necessarily represent a wider and more general authority than the symbol of binding and loosing.

The special power of binding and loosing, having been bestowed upon Peter in the same terms as those in which it was conferred later on the other Apostles (Matt. xviii. 18), it is plain from the context of the latter chapter that this lesser power only concerns individual cases ("if thy brother sin against thee," etc.), which is in entire agreement with the sense of the metaphor used in the Gospel. Only personal problems of conscience and the direction of individual souls fall under the authority to bind and loose which was given to the other Apostles after Peter; whereas the power of the keys of the Kingdom conferred solely on Peter can only refer to the whole of the Church (if we are to follow not only the exact sense of our text, but general Biblical analogy) and must denote a supreme social and political

authority, the general administration of the Kingdom of God on Earth. The life of the Christian soul must neither be separated from the organization of the Universal Church, nor confused with it. They are two different orders of things, though closely interconnected.

Just as the teaching of the Church is no mere compound of personal beliefs, so the government of the Church cannot be reduced to the direction of individual consciences or of private morality. Founded on unity of faith, the Universal Church as a real and living social organism must also display unity of action sufficient to react successfully at every moment of her historic existence against the combined attacks of those hostile forces which would divide and destroy her. Unity of action for a vast and complicated social organism implies a whole system of organic functions subordinate to a common center which can set them in motion in the direction desired at any given moment. As the unity of the orthodox faith is finally guaranteed by the dogmatic authority of a single individual speaking for all, so unity of ecclesiastical action is necessarily conditioned by the directing authority of a single individual bearing sway over the whole Church. But in the One Holy Church, founded upon truth, government cannot be separated from doctrine; and the central and supreme power in the ecclesiastical sphere can only belong to him who by divinely aided authority represents and displays in the religious sphere the unity of true faith.

This is why the keys of the Kingdom have been given to none other than him who is by his faith the Rock of the Church.

VI

The government of the Universal Church. The center of unity

THE Church is not only the perfect union of mankind with God in Christ, but it is also the social order established by the Divine Will in which and through which this union of the Divine and the human may be accomplished. Founded on eternal Truth, the Church is not only the perfect Life (in the future), but it has also always been in the past and still is in the present the Way which leads to this ideal perfection. Man's social existence upon Earth cannot be excluded from the new union of the human and the Divine which is accomplished in Christ. If the elements even of our material life are transformed and sanctified in the sacraments, how can the social and political order, which is an essential form of human existence, be left a prey to the warfare of selfish ambitions, the clash of murderous passions and the conflict of erroneous opinions? Since man is essentially a social being, the ultimate aim of the working of God in mankind is the creation of a perfect universal society. But it is not a creation *ex nihilo;* for the material of the perfect society is given us, namely society in its imperfect state, mankind as it is; and this is neither excluded nor suppressed by the Kingdom of God, but drawn into the sphere of the Kingdom, to be regenerated, sanctified and transfigured. The religion which seeks to bind man's individual being to Christ is not content with an invisible and purely spiritual communion; it desires that man should communicate with his God throughout his entire being, even by the physical act of feeding. In this mystical but real communion, the matter of the sacrament is not simply destroyed and annihilated, it is transubstantiated, that is to say, the interior and invisible substance of the bread and wine is lifted into the sphere of Christ's ascended bodily nature and absorbed by it, while the phenomenal reality or outward appearance of these objects remains without sensible change that they may act in the given conditions of our physical existence and so establish a link between that existence and the Body of God. So also must the collective, common life of mankind be mystically transubstantiated while retaining the "species" or outward forms of earthly society, and these very forms must be duly ordained and consecrated to serve as the actual foundation and visible instruments of the social activity of Christ in His Church.

The ultimate aim of the work of God in mankind, regarded from the Christian standpoint, is not the manifestation of the divine power — that is the Moslem conception — but the free, mutual union of mankind with God. And the proper means of accomplishing this work is not the hidden operation of Providence guiding individuals and nations by unknown ways to uncomprehended ends; such a purely and exclusively supernatural operation, though always necessary, is not sufficient in itself. Moreover, since the actual historic union of God and Man in Christ, Man must himself play a positive part in his appointed destiny and as a social being communicate in the life of Christ. But if mortal men here below are actually to have a real share in the invisible and supernatural government of Christ, then that government must assume visible and natural social forms. Some social institution, whose origin, end and powers are divine, while its means of action are human and adapted to the needs of historic existence, is essential to represent and minister to the perfection of divine grace and truth in Jesus Christ that this perfection may operate in, and co-operate with, imperfect human nature.

If the Church is to guide the common life of mankind towards the goal of divine love, and to direct public opinion on the road to divine truth, she must possess a universal government divinely authorized. This government must be clearly defined so as to be recognizable to all, and permanent so as to form a standing court of appeal; it must be divine in substance so as to be finally binding upon the religious conscience of every instructed and well-intentioned person, and it must be human and imperfect in its historic manifestation so as to admit the possibility of moral resistance and allow room for doubts, struggle, temptations and all that constitutes the merit of free and genuinely human virtue.

Though the supreme authority of the Church may admit of various administrative forms according to differences of time and place, yet if it is to form the primary basis of union between the social conscience of mankind and the providential government of God, and to share in the divine Majesty while adapting itself to the realities of human life, it must always as the center of unity preserve its purely monarchical character. If the supreme authority of the Universal Church were vested solely in the collective administration of a council, the unity of her human activity linking her to the absolute unity of divine truth could only be based on one of two things: either on the perfect unanimity of all its members, or else on a majority of opinions, as in secular assemblies. The latter supposition is incompatible with the majesty of God, Who would be obliged constantly to accommodate His will and His truth to the chance convergences of human opinion and the interplay of human passions. As for unanimity or complete and permanent harmony, such a condition of the social conscience could, by its intrinsic moral excellence, undoubtedly correspond to the divine perfection and infallibly manifest the action of God in mankind. But while the political principle of a majority vote

comes short of the dignity of God, unfortunately the ideal principle of immediate, spontaneous and permanent unanimity is equally far in advance of the present state of man. That perfect unity which Jesus Christ in His high-priestly prayer held up before us as the final objective of His work cannot be assumed as the present and obvious starting-point of that work. The surest way never to achieve the desired perfection is to imagine that it is already achieved.

Conscious unanimity and solidarity, brotherly love and free agreement, such is the universally accepted ideal of the Church. But the difference between an idle dream and the divine ideal of unity is that the latter has an actual foundation (the δός μοι που στω of social mechanics) from which to gain ground little by little on Earth and to achieve gradual and successive conquests over all the powers of discord. A real and indivisible principle of unity is absolutely necessary to counteract the deep-seated and active tendency to division in the world and even in the Church itself The principle of that universal religious unity of grace and truth, which is eventually to become the very essence of the life of each individual believer and the perfect and indissoluble bond between him and his neighbor, must none the less in the meantime have an objective existence and act everywhere under the "species" of a visible and definite social authority.

The perfection of the one universal Church consists in the harmony and unanimity of all its members; but its very existence amid actual disharmony requires a unifying and reconciling power immune from this disharmony and in continual reaction against it, asserting itself above all divisions and gathering to itself all men of good will, denouncing and condemning whatever is opposed to the Kingdom of God on Earth. Whoever desires that Kingdom must desire the only way that will lead mankind collectively to it. Between the hateful reality of the disharmony reigning in this world and the longed-for unity of perfect love in which God reigns, there is the necessary road of a juridical and authoritative unity linking human fact to divine right.

The perfect circle of the Universal Church requires a unique center, not so much for its perfection as for its very existence. The Church upon Earth, called to gather in the multitude of the nations, must, if she is to remain an active society, possess a definite universal authority to set against national divisions; if she is to enter the current of history and undergo continual change and adaptation in her external circumstances and relationships and yet preserve her identity, she requires an authority essentially conservative but nevertheless active, fundamentally unchangeable though outwardly adaptable; and, finally, if she is set amid the frailty of man to assert herself in reaction against all the powers of evil, she must be equipped with an absolutely firm and impregnable foundation, stronger than the gates of Hell.

Now, we know, on the one hand, that Christ foresaw the necessity of such an ecclesiastical monarchy and therefore conferred on a single individual supreme and undivided authority over His Church; and, on the other hand, we see that of all the ecclesiastical powers in the Christian world there is only one which perpetually and unchangingly preserves its central and universal character and at the same time is specially connected by an ancient and widespread tradition with him to whom Christ said: Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Christ's words could not remain without their effect in Christian history; and the principal phenomenon in Christian history must have an adequate cause in the word of God. Where, then, have Christ's words to Peter produced a corresponding effect except in the Chair of Peter? Where does that Chair find an adequate cause except in the promise made to Peter?

The living truths of religion do not compel the reason in the manner of geometrical theorems. Moreover, it would be unsafe to assert that even the truths of mathematics are unanimously accepted by everyone for the sole reason of their intrinsic proof; they meet with general acceptance because no one is concerned to reject them. I am not so simple as to hope to convince those who are influenced by other motives more powerful than the search for religious truth. In setting out the general proofs of the permanent primacy of Peter as the foundation of the Universal Church, my only aim has been to assist the intellectual task of those who deny this truth, not from personal or emotional reasons, but from unconscious error and inherited prejudice. In pursuance of this aim, I must now, while keeping my eyes always fixed on the brilliant searchlight of the Biblical record, embark for a moment on the dark and uncertain domain of universal history.

VII

The monarchies foretold by Daniel. "Roma" and "Amor"

THE historic life of mankind began with the confusion of Babel (Gen. xi.); it will end in the perfect harmony of the New Jerusalem (Apoc. xxi.). Between these two extreme limits, described in the first and last books of Holy Scripture, takes place the evolution of universal history of which a symbolic representation is given us in the sacred book which may be regarded as transitional between the Old and New Testaments, the book of the prophet Daniel (Dan. ii. 31-36).

Since mankind on Earth is not, and was never meant to be, a world of pure spirits, it needs for the expression and development of the unity of its inner life an external social organism which must become more centralized as it grows in extent and diversity. Just as the life of the individual human soul manifests itself by means of the organized human body, so the collective soul of regenerate humanity, the invisible Church, requires a visible social organism as the symbol and instrument of its unity. From this point of view, the history of mankind presents itself as the gradual formation of a universal social entity or of the one Catholic Church in the broadest sense of the term. This work is inevitably divided into two main parts: (1) the outward unification of the nations of history, or the formation of the universal *body* of mankind by the efforts, more or less unconscious, of earthly powers under the invisible and indirect action of Providence, and (2) the vivifying of this body by the mighty breath of the God-Man and its further development by the combined action of divine grace and more or less conscious human forces. In other words, we have here, on the one hand, the formation of natural universal monarchy and, on the other, the formation and development of spiritual monarchy or the Universal Church on the basis and in the framework of the corresponding natural organism. The first part of this great work constitutes the essence of ancient or pagan history; the second part mainly determines modern or Christian history. The connecting link is the history of the people of Israel who, under the active guidance of the living God, prepared the setting, both organic and national, for the appearance of the God-Man, Who is both the spiritual principle of unity for the universal body and the absolute center of history.

While the chosen nation was preparing the natural body of the individual God-Man, the Gentile nations were evolving the social body of the collective God-Man, the Universal Church. And since this task allotted to paganism was achieved by purely human efforts guided only indirectly and invisibly by divine Providence, it was bound to proceed by a series of attempts and experiments. Previous to any effective universal monarchy we see the rise of various national monarchies claiming universality but incapable of achieving it.

After the Assyrio-Babylonian monarchy, the head of gold, denoting the purest and most concentrated despotism, comes the monarchy of the Medes and Persians represented by the breast and arms of silver which symbolize a less unmitigated, less concentrated, but on the other hand much more extensive despotism, embracing the whole scene of contemporary history from Greece on the one side to India on the other. Next comes the Macedonian monarchy of Alexander the Great, the brazen belly engulfing Hellas and the East. But despite the fruitfulness of Hellenism in the sphere of intellectual and aesthetic culture, it proved impotent in practical affairs and incapable of creating a political framework or a center of unity for the vast multitude of nations which it penetrated. In administration it took over without any essential alteration the absolutism of the national despots which it found in the East; and though it imposed the unity of its culture on the world which it conquered, it could not prevent that world from splitting into two great semi-Hellenized national States, the Helleno-Egyptian kingdom of the Ptolemies and the Helleno-Syrian kingdom of the Seleucids. These two kingdoms, at one moment engaged in bitter warfare, at another precariously allied by dynastic marriages, were well symbolized by the two feet of the colossus in which the iron of primitive despotism was mingled with the soft clay of a decadent culture.

Thus the pagan world, divided between two rival powers, with Alexandria and Antioch as their two political and intellectual centers, could not provide an adequate historic basis for Christian unity. But there was a stone — *Capitoli immobile saxum* — a little Italian town, whose origin was hidden among mysterious legends and prophetic portents, and whose real name even was unknown. This stone hurled forth by the providence of the God of history smote the feet of clay of the Greco-barbarian world of the East, overthrew and crushed to powder the impotent colossus, and became a great mountain. The pagan world was given a real center of unity. A truly international and universal monarchy was established, embracing both East and West. Not only was it far more extensive than the greatest of the national monarchies, not only did it include far more heterogeneous national and cultural elements, but it was, above all, powerfully centralized, and it transformed these varied elements into a positive, active whole. Instead of a monstrous image made up of heterogeneous parts, mankind became an organized and homogeneous body, the Roman Empire, with an individual living

center in Cæsar Augustus, the trustee and representative of the united will of mankind.

But who was this Cæsar and how had he come to represent the living center of humanity? On what was his power based? Long and painful experience had convinced the nations of East and West that continual strife and division were a curse and that some center of unity was essential to the peace of the world. This vague but very real desire for peace and unity threw the pagan world at the feet of an adventurer who succeeded in replacing beliefs and principles by the weapons of his legions and own personal courage. Thus the unity of the Empire was based solely on force and chance. Though the first of the Cæsars seemed to deserve his fortune by his personal genius, and the second justified his to a certain extent by his calculated piety and wise moderation, the third was a monster and was succeeded by idiots and madmen. The universal State which should have been the social incarnation of Reason itself took shape in an absolutely irrational phenomenon, the absurdity of which was only heightened by the blasphemy of the Emperor's apotheosis.

The Divine Word, individually united to human nature and desiring to unite socially with Himself the collective being of Man, could not take either the confusion of an anarchic mass of nations or the autocracy of a tyrant as the starting-point of this union. He could only unite human society with Himself by means of a power founded upon truth. In the social sphere we are not directly and primarily concerned with personal virtues and defects. We believe the imperial power of pagan Rome to have been evil and false, not merely because of the crimes and follies of a Tiberius or a Nero, but mainly because, whether represented by Caligula or Antonine, it was itself based on violence and crowned with falsehood. The actual Emperor, the momentary creature of the prætorians and the legionaries, only owed his power to crude, blind force; the ideal, deified Emperor was an impious fiction.

Against the false man-god of political monarchy the true God-Man set up the spiritual power of ecclesiastical monarchy founded on Truth and Love. Universal monarchy and international unity were to remain; the center of unity was to keep its place. But the central power itself, its character, its origin and its authority — all this was to be renewed.

The Romans themselves had a vague presentiment of this mysterious transformation. While the ordinary name of Rome was the Greek word for "Might," and a poet of decadent Greece had hailed her new masters by that name: χαιρέ μοι, Ρώμα, θυγάτηρ Ἄρηος — yet the citizens of the Eternal City believed that they discovered the true meaning of her name by reading it backwards in Semitic fashion: AMOR; and the ancient legend revived by Virgil connected the Roman people and the dynasty of Cæsar in particular with the mother of Love and

through her with the supreme God. But their Love was the servant of death and their supreme God was a parricide. The piety of the Romans, which is their chief claim to glory and the foundation of their greatness, was a true sentiment though rooted in a false principle, and it was just that change of principle that was necessary in order that the true Rome might be revealed based upon the true religion. The countless triads of parricidal gods must be replaced by the single divine Trinity, consubstantial and indivisible, and the universal society of mankind must be set up, not on the basis of an Empire of Might, but on that of a Church of Love. Was it a mere coincidence that, when Jesus Christ wished to announce the foundation of His true universal monarchy, not upon the servile submission of its subjects nor upon the autocracy of a human ruler, but upon the free surrender of men's faith and love to God's truth and grace, He chose for that pronouncement the moment of His arrival with His disciples at the outskirts of Cæsarea Philippi, the town which a slave of the Cæsars had dedicated to the genius of his master? Or again, was it a coincidence that Jesus chose the neighborhood of the Sea of Tiberias for the giving of the final sanction to that which He had founded, and that under the shadow of those monuments which spoke of the actual ruler of false Rome He consecrated the future ruler of true Rome in words which indicated both the mystical name of the Eternal City and the supreme principle of His new Kingdom: Simon Bar-Jona, *lovest* thou Me more than these?

But why must true Love, which knows no envy and whose unity implies no exclusiveness, be centered in a single individual and assume for its operation in society the form of monarchy in preference to all others? Since here it is not a question of the omnipotence of God, which might impose truth and justice upon men from without, but rather of the Divine love in which man shares by a free act of adherence, the direct action of the Godhead must be reduced to a minimum. It cannot be entirely suppressed since all men are false and no human entity, either individual or collective, left to its own resources, can maintain itself in constant and progressive relationship to the Godhead. But the fruitful Love of God united to the Divine Wisdom *quae in superfluis non abundat,* in order to assist human weakness while at the same time allowing human forces full play, chooses the path along which the unifying and life-giving action of supernatural truth and grace on the mass of mankind will encounter the fewest natural obstacles and will find a social framework externally conformable and adapted to the manifestation of true unity; and the path which facilitates union between the Divine and the human in the social order by forming a central unifying organ within humanity itself is the path of monarchy. Otherwise the creation afresh each time of a spontaneous unity on the chaotic basis of independent opinions and conflicting wills would require each time a new, direct and manifestly miraculous intervention of the Godhead, an activity *ex nihilo* forced upon men and depriving them of their moral freedom. As

the Divine Word did not appear upon Earth in His heavenly splendor, but in the lowliness of human nature, as today in order to give Himself to the faithful He assumes the lowly appearance of material “species,” so it was not His will to rule human society directly by His divine power, but rather to employ as the normal instrument of His social activity a form of unity already in existence among men, namely, universal monarchy. Only it was necessary to regenerate, spiritualize and sanctify this social form by substituting the eternal principle of grace and truth for the mortal principle of violence and deception; to replace the head of an army, who in the spirit of falsehood declared himself to be a god, by the head of all the faithful who in the spirit of truth recognized and acknowledged in his Master the Son of the living God; to dethrone a raving despot who would fain have enslaved the human race and drained the blood of his victim, and to raise up in his stead the loving servant of a God Who shed His Blood for mankind.

In the borders of Cæsarea and on the shores of the Sea of Tiberias, Jesus dethroned Cæsar — not the Cæsar of the tribute-money nor the Christian Cæsar of the future, but the deified Cæsar, the sole absolute and independent sovereign of the universe, the supreme center of unity for the human race. He dethroned him because He had created a new and better center of unity, a new and better sovereign power based upon faith and love, truth and grace. And while dethroning the false and impious absolutism of the pagan Cæsars, Jesus confirmed and made eternal the universal monarchy of Rome by giving it its true theocratic basis. It was in a certain sense nothing more than a change of dynasty; the dynasty of Julius Cæsar, supreme pontiff and god, gave place to the dynasty of Simon Peter, supreme pontiff and servant of the servants of God.

VIII

The "Son of Man" and the "Rock"

THE interpretation given in our last chapter helps to explain why the prophetic vision of the great pagan powers, which is as complete and exact as such a vision could be, makes no mention of the greatest power of all, the Roman Empire. It was because this Empire was not a part of the monstrous colossus doomed to destruction but was the abiding material framework and mold of the Kingdom of God. The great powers of the ancient world were merely passing figures upon the stage of history; Rome alone lives forever. The rock of the Capitol was hallowed by the stone of the Bible, and the Roman Empire was transformed into the great mountain which in the prophetic vision sprang from that stone. And what can that stone itself mean except the monarchical power of him who was called the Rock *par excellence* and on whom the Universal Church, the mountain of God, was founded?

The image of this mysterious stone in the book of Daniel is usually applied to Jesus Christ Himself. It is noteworthy, however, that though Jesus made considerable use of the prophet Daniel in His preaching, yet in speaking of His own person He did not borrow from the prophet the symbol of the stone, but another title which He used almost as His own name: the Son of Man. It is this very name which He employs in the crucial passage of St. Matthew: *Quem dicunt homines esse Filium Hominis?* Jesus is the Son of Man seen by the prophet Daniel (Dan. vii. 13) whereas the stone (Dan. ii. 34, 35, 45) does not directly denote Jesus, but rather the fundamental authority of the Church, to the first representative of which this symbol was applied by the Son of Man Himself: *Et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus.*

The context of the prophecy of Daniel directly confirms our view, for it speaks of a Kingdom coming from God, but nevertheless visible and earthly, destined to conquer, destroy and replace the great pagan Empires. The appearance and triumph of this fifth Kingdom, which in a parallel passage is called "the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 18, 27) and which is obviously the Universal Church, are symbolically represented by this stone which, after breaking the feet of the colossus, becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. If, then, the stone mentioned by Daniel directly denoted Christ, it would follow that it was Christ

Himself Who became the “great mountain,” or, in other words, the universal monarchy of the Church, to which the pagan Empires gave place. But why should we go out of our way to attribute to the truly inspired author of this wonderful book such confused and incongruous imagery, when there is all the time a clear and harmonious interpretation not only open to us but absolutely forced upon us by the comparison between these prophetic passages and the corresponding passage of the Gospel? Both in Daniel and in St. Matthew we find the Son of Man and the Rock of the Church. Now, it is absolutely certain that the Son of Man, whether in the prophetic book or in the Gospel, denotes one and the same Person, the Messiah; the analogy demands, therefore, that the Rock of the Church bears in both passages the same sense. But in the Gospel the Rock is obviously the prince of the Apostles — *tu es Petrus;* hence the “stone” of the prophet Daniel must equally foreshadow the original trustee of monarchical authority in the Universal Church, the rock which was taken and hurled not by human hands, but by the Son of the living God and by the heavenly Father Himself revealing to the supreme ruler of the Church that divine-human truth which was the source of his authority.

There is a further remarkable coincidence to be noted. It was the great king of Babylon, the typical representative of false universal monarchy, who saw in a mysterious dream the chief representative of true universal monarchy under the significant image of a stone which was to become his actual name. Moreover, he saw the complete contrast between the two monarchies: the one beginning in the head of gold and ending in feet of clay which crumble to dust, the other beginning in a little stone and ending in a huge mountain which filled the world.

IX

Ancient and modern witness to the primacy of Peter

GRANTED that Jesus Christ established in the person of St. Peter a central sovereign authority over the Church; it is still not clear how and for what purpose this authority could have passed to the Roman Church and the Papacy." This is the reply which sincere Orthodox have been compelled by the evidence to make to us. In other words, they admit that the stone was shaped by no human hand, but they shut their eyes to the great mountain which has grown out of it. And yet the phenomenon is amply explained in Holy Scripture by similes and parables which are familiar to everyone, though for all that none the better understood.

Though the transformation of a stone into a mountain is only a symbol, the transformation of a simple, almost imperceptible seed into an infinitely larger and more complicated organism is an actual fact. And it is by just this fact that the New Testament foretells and illustrates the development of the Church, as of a great tree which began in an imperceptible grain of seed and today gives ample shelter to the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air.

Now, even among Catholics, we meet with ultra-dogmatic spirits who, while justly admiring the vast oak tree which covers them with its shade, absolutely refuse to admit that all this abundance of organic forms has grown from a structure as simple and rudimentary as that of an ordinary acorn. According to them, though the oak arose out of the acorn, yet the acorn must have contained in a distinct and discernible form, if not every leaf, at least every branch of the great tree, and must have been not only identical in substance with the latter but similar to it in every detail; whereupon ultra-critical spirits of the opposite school set to work to examine the wretched acorn minutely from every angle. Naturally they discover in it no resemblance whatever to the entwining roots, the stout trunk, the leafy branches or the tough corrugated foliage of the great tree. "What humbug!" they exclaim, "the acorn is simply an acorn and can never be anything else; it is only too obvious where the great oak and all its characteristics came from. The Jesuits invented it at the Vatican Council; we saw it with our own eyes — in the book of Janus."

At the risk of appearing to be a free-thinker to the extreme dogmatists and of being at the same time labeled a Jesuit in disguise by the critics, I must affirm the unquestionable truth that the acorn actually has a quite simple and rudimentary structure and that though all the component parts of a great oak cannot be discovered in it, yet the oak has actually grown out of the acorn without any artificial stimulus or infringement of the laws of nature, but by its own right, nay, even by divine right. Since God, Who is not bound by the limitations of time and space and of the mechanism of the material world, sees concealed in the actual germ of things all their future potentialities, so in the little acorn He must not only have seen but ordained and blessed the mighty oak which was to grow from it; in the grain of mustard seed of Peter's faith He discerned and foretold the vast tree of the Catholic Church which was to cover the Earth with its branches.

Though Peter was entrusted by Jesus Christ with that universal sovereign authority which was to endure and develop within the Church throughout its existence upon Earth, he did not personally exercise this authority except in a measure and in a form suited to the primitive condition of the Apostolic Church. The action of the prince of the Apostles had as little resemblance to modern papal administration as the acorn has to the oak; but this does not prevent the Papacy from being the natural, logical and legitimate development of the primacy of Peter. The primacy itself is so marked in the historical books of the New Testament that it has never been disputed by any theologian of good faith, whether Orthodox, rationalist or Jew.[1] We have already cited the eminent Jewish writer Joseph Salvador as an unbiased witness to the historical foundation of the Church by Jesus Christ and to the outstanding part allotted to Peter in its foundation. A writer equally free from Catholic bias, David Strauss, the well-known leader of the German school of critics, has found himself compelled to defend the primacy of Peter against Protestant controversialists whom he accuses of prejudice.[2] As regards the representatives of Eastern Orthodoxy, we cannot do better than quote once more our one and only theologian, Philaret of Moscow. For him the primacy

---

[1] The same sincerity is not usually found in Protestant writers. The best among them, however, admit the fact of the primacy though they make fruitless attempts to interpret it according to their liking. Take, for instance, the words of M. de Pressensé *(Histoire des trois premiers siècles du Christianisme,* 1st ed., vol. i. pp. 358-360): **"**Throughout these early years the Apostle Peter exercised a predominant influence; the part which he played at this date has been adduced as a proof of his primacy. But on closer examination of the evidence it is clear that all he did was to develop his own natural gifts (!) purified and enhanced by the Spirit of God." "Moreover St. Luke's record lends no color to any notion of a hierarchy. Everything in St. Peter's behavior is natural and spontaneous. He is not official president of any kind of apostolic college." (M. de Pressensé is obviously confusing the accident of a more or less pronounced official status with the substance of primacy.) "He only acts on the advice of his brethren" — according to Protestant ideas, it seems, advice excludes authority — "whether in the choice of a new Apostle or at Pentecost, before the people or before the Sanhedrin. Peter had been the most humiliated of all the first Christians, hence the reason that he was promoted the most rapidly." With this kind of facetiousness, Protestantism seeks to evade explicit texts of Holy Scripture after declaring Scripture to be the one and only source of religious truth.

[2] *Vie de Jésus* (tr. Littré, Paris 1839), vol. i. part 2, p. 584; cf. p. 378.

of Peter is "clear and evident." [1] After recalling the fact that Peter was entrusted by Christ with the special task of confirming his brethren (Luke xxii. 32), that is to say, the other Apostles, the famous Russian prelate continues thus: "In point of fact, although the Resurrection of our Lord had been announced to the women who came bearing spices, this did not confirm the Apostles in their faith in the event (Luke xxiv. ii). But when the Risen Lord had appeared to Peter, the other Apostles (even before the appearance to them all together) declared with conviction: The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon (Luke xxiv. 34). Finally, when it is a question of filling the gap left in the Apostolic band by the apostasy of Judas, it is Peter who is the first to draw attention to the fact and to take the decisive step; when the moment arrives, just after the descent of the Holy Spirit, for the solemn inauguration of the preaching of the Gospel, "Peter standing up . . . "; when the foundations of the Christian Church are to be laid among pagans as well as among Jews, it is Peter who gives Cornelius baptism and thus, not for the first time, fulfils the utterance of Christ: Thou art Peter, etc." [2]

In bearing this witness to the truth, the eloquent doctor of the modern Russian Church is but the echo of the still more eloquent doctor of the ancient Greek Church. St. John Chrysostom long ago anticipated and triumphantly refuted the objections to the primacy of Peter which are made even today on the ground of certain incidents in the record of the Gospel and of the Apostolic Church, such as Simon's denial in the High Priest's palace, his relations with St. Paul, and so forth. We refer our Orthodox readers to the arguments of the great Œcumenical Doctor.[3] No papist could assert more forcibly and insistently the primacy of power (and not merely of honor) which belonged to Peter in the Apostolic Church. The prince of the Apostles, to whose care all were committed by Christ (άτε αυτος πάντας εγχείρισθεις) had, according to this saintly writer, the power of nominating a successor to Judas on his own authority, and if on this occasion he called in the assistance of the other Apostles, it was by no means of obligation, but simply of his good pleasure that he did so." [4]

Holy Scripture tells us of the primacy of Peter; his right to absolute sovereign authority in the Church is attested by Orthodox tradition; but no one possessed of any historical feeling or indeed of any ordinary common sense would expect to find legally defined powers taking effect according to fixed rules in the primitive Church, not only of the period when "the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul," but also long after. There is always the temptation to expect to find

---

[1] *Sermons and Addresses of Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow* (1873 etc.), vol. ii. p. 214.
[2] *ibid.*
[3] The Greco-Russian Church, as is well known, specially attributes this title to three ancient Fathers: St. Basil of Cæsarea, surnamed the Great, St. Gregory Nazianzen, surnamed the Theologian, and St. John Chrysostom. They have a feast in common on January 30 in our calendar.
[4] *Works* ix. 27, 30-31.

in the acorn the branches of the oak. The real and living seed of the supreme authority of the Church which we discern in the prince of the Apostles could only be displayed in the primitive Church by practical leadership on the part of Peter in every matter which concerned the Universal Church, and this is what we actually find in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.[1]

Since there are actually critics who do not recognize the personality of St. Paul in his epistles, there will always be some who will not observe the outstanding part played by St. Peter in the foundation of the Church. We will not stay longer to refute them, but we will pass on to the objection raised against the succession of Rome to the position of the Galilean fisherman.

[1] Those of our Orthodox readers who find neither the authority of saintly Fathers such as John Chrysostom nor that of Russian theologians such as Mgr. Philaret sufficient to convince them of Peter's unique place in New Testament history will perhaps be amenable to what may be called statistical proof. Since it occurred to me that none of Jesus' intimate disciples had so considerable a claim to a prominent place as St. John, the beloved Apostle, I counted up the number of times that John and Peter are mentioned respectively in the Gospels and Acts, and found the proportion to be about 1 to 4. St. Peter is mentioned by name 171 times (114 in the Gospels and 57 in the Acts), St. John only 46 times (38 times in the Gospels, including the instances where he refers to himself indirectly, and 8 times in the Acts).

X

The Apostle Peter and the Papacy

THE Apostle Peter possesses the primacy of power; but why should the Pope of Rome succeed to this primacy?’ We must confess our entire inability to understand how such a question can be taken seriously. Once it is admitted that there is in the Universal Church a fundamental supreme authority established by Christ in the person of St. Peter, then it must follow that this authority is in existence somewhere. And it seems to us that the obvious impossibility of discovering it anywhere else but at Rome is at once a sufficient reason for supporting the Catholic contention.

Since neither the patriarch of Constantinople nor the Synod of St. Petersburg claims or can possibly claim to represent the rock of the Universal Church, that is to say the real and fundamental unity of ecclesiastical authority, there is no choice but either to abandon all idea of such a unity and accept a state of division, confusion and bondage as the normal condition of the Church, or else to acknowledge the claims and actual validity of the one and only existing authority which has always shown itself to be the center of ecclesiastical unity. No amount of argument can overcome the evidence for the fact that apart from Rome there only exist national churches, such as the Armenian or the Greek church, State churches such as the Russian or Anglican, or else sects founded by individuals, such as the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Irvingites, and so forth. The Roman Catholic Church is the only church that is neither a national church, nor a State church, nor a sect founded by a man; it is the only church in the world which maintains and asserts the principle of universal social unity against individual egoism and national particularism; it is the only church which maintains and asserts the freedom of the spiritual power against the absolutism of the State; in a word, it is the only church against which the gates of Hell have not prevailed.

“By their fruits ye shall know them.” In the sphere of religious fellowship the fruit of Catholicism (for those who have remained Catholics) is the unity and freedom of the Church; the fruit of Protestantism for its adherents both in the East and in the West is division and bondage: division chiefly in the West and bondage in the East. Think and say what you will of the Roman Church or of the Papacy; we ourselves are very far from seeing or expecting to find in either the

achievement of perfection or the realization of the ideal. We are aware that the rock of the Church is not the Church itself, that the foundation is not the same as the building, nor the way the same as the goal. All that we are maintaining is that the Papacy is the sole international and independent ecclesiastical authority, the only real and permanent basis for the Church's universal activity. That is an indisputable fact and in itself compels us to acknowledge the Pope to be the sole trustee of those powers and privileges which St. Peter received from Christ. And since the universal monarchy of the Church was not to eliminate the universal monarchy of the political world, but to transubstantiate it, was it not natural that the visible seat of the two corresponding monarchies should remain the same? If, as has already been said, the dynasty of Julius Cæ,sar was in a certain sense, to give place to the dynasty of Simon Peter, if Cæsarism was to yield to Papacy, it was surely to be expected that the Papacy should take up its abode in the existing center of the universal Empire.

The transference to Rome of the supreme ecclesiastical authority established by Christ in the person of St. Peter is a patent fact attested by the tradition of the Church and justified by the logic of circumstances. As regards the question of the formal manner in which the authority of Peter was transmitted to the bishop of Rome, that is a historical problem which for lack of documentary evidence can hardly be scientifically solved. We believe the Orthodox tradition, which is recorded in our liturgical books, to the effect that St. Peter on his arrival at Rome definitely fixed his see there and before his death personally nominated his successor. Later times saw the Popes elected by the Christian community of the city of Rome until the present mode of election by the college of Cardinals was definitely established. Furthermore, as early as the second century we have in the writings of St. Ireneus unimpeachable evidence that the Church of Rome was already regarded by the whole Christian world as the center of unity, and that the bishop of Rome enjoyed a permanent position of supreme authority, though the forms in which this authority found expression were bound to vary with the times, becoming more definite and imposing in proportion as the development of the whole social structure of the Church became more intricate and diversified.

"In fact" (to quote a historian of the critical rationalist school) "in 196 the chosen heads of the churches were attempting to create ecclesiastical unity; one of them, the head of the Roman Church, seemed to claim the rôle of executive authority within the community and to assume the position of sovereign pontiff." [1] But it was not merely a question of executive authority, for a little further on the same author makes the following admission: "Tertullian and Cyprian appear to hail

[1] B. Aubé, *Les chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain, de la fin des Antonins au milieu du troisième siècle,* p. 69.

the Church of Rome as the principal church and in a certain degree the guardian and keeper of the faith and of genuine tradition." [1]

In the early days of Christianity the monarchical authority of the Universal Church was but a seed scarcely visible, but nevertheless pregnant with life; by the second century, this seed has visibly developed, as the acts of Pope Victor testify; in the third century, the same witness is borne by the acts of Pope Stephen and Pope Dionysius, and in the fourth, by those of Pope Julius I. In the following century, we already see the supreme authority and monarchical power of the Roman Church growing like a vigorous sapling under Pope St. Leo I; and finally by the ninth century the Papacy is already the mighty and majestic tree which covers the Christian world with the shadow of its branches.

That is the great fact, the main fact, the manifestation and fulfilment in history of the divine utterance: Thou art Peter. This broad fact is the outcome of divine law, while particular facts regarding the transmission of the sovereign power, the papal elections and so forth concern the purely human side of the Church and have no more than a secondary interest from the religious point of view. Here again the Roman Empire, foreshadowing as it does in a certain sense the Roman Church, may provide us with an analogy. Since Rome was the undisputed center of the Empire, the individual who was proclaimed Emperor at Rome was immediately recognized as such by the whole world without any question as to whether it was the Senate or the prætorians or the votes of the people which had raised him to the purple. In exceptional cases, when the Emperor was elected by the legions outside Rome, his first concern was to hasten to the imperial city, without whose support his election would be regarded by everyone as only provisional. The Rome of the Popes became for universal Christendom what the Rome of the Cæsars had been for the pagan world. The bishop of Rome was, by his very office, the supreme pastor and doctor of the whole Church. There was no need to trouble about the method of his election; that depended on circumstances and conditions of the moment. There was usually no more reason for doubting the legality of the election of the bishop of Rome than that of the election of any other bishop. And once his election to the episcopate was recognized, the head of the central church and the occupant of the Chair of St. Peter was *ipso facto* in possession of all the rights and powers which Christ conferred upon the rock of the Church. There were exceptional instances where doubt might be felt about the election; antipopes are not unknown to history. But just as the usurpers Demetrius and Peter III in no way robbed the Russian monarchy of its lawful authority, so the antipopes provide no argument against the Papacy. Any apparent abnormality in the history of the Church belongs to the human "species" rather than to the divine "substance" of the

[1] *ibid.,* p. 146.

religious society. If, by some chance, adulterated or even poisoned wine were used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, would this sacrilege have the slightest effect on the validity of the Sacrament itself?

In maintaining that the bishop of Rome is the true successor of St. Peter and therefore the impregnable rock of the Church and the steward of the Kingdom of Heaven, we are putting on one side the question whether the prince of the Apostles was ever personally in Rome. This fact is attested by the tradition of the Church both in the East and in the West, and we ourselves feel no doubt in the matter. But if there are Christians in good faith who are more susceptible than ourselves to the specious arguments of Protestant scholars, we have no wish to dispute the matter with them. We might even admit that St. Peter never went personally to Rome, and yet at the same time from the religious point of view maintain a spiritual and mystical transmission of his sovereign authority to the bishop of the Eternal City. The history of early Christianity supplies us with a striking instance of an analogous relationship. St. Paul had no natural link whatever with Jesus Christ; he was not a witness of our Lord's life on Earth nor did he receive his commission in any visible or public fashion; nevertheless he is recognized by all Christians as one of the greatest Apostles. His apostolate was a public ministry in the Church and yet its origin, in his relation to Jesus Christ, is a mystical and miraculous fact. Now, if a phenomenon of a supernatural order formed the original link between Jesus Christ and St. Paul and made the latter a chosen vessel and the Apostle of the Gentiles, though at the same time this miraculous commission did not prevent his further activity from being subject to the natural conditions of human life and historic circumstances, then similarly that original relationship between St. Peter and the See of Rome which created the Papacy might well depend upon a mystical and transcendental act, which would in no way deprive the Papacy itself, once constituted, of the character of a normal social institution acting under the ordinary conditions of earthly life. The mighty spirit of St. Peter, guided by his Master's almighty Will, might well seek to perpetuate the center of ecclesiastical unity by taking up his abode in the center of political unity already formed by Providence and thus making the bishop of Rome heir to his primacy. According to this theory (which, let us remember, would become necessary only if it were conclusively shown that St. Peter did not go to Rome), the Pope would be regarded as the successor of St. Peter in the same spiritual and yet absolutely real sense in which, *mutatis mutandis,* St. Paul must be recognized as a true Apostle chosen and sent by Jesus Christ, though he had no knowledge of Him except in a miraculous vision. St. Paul's apostleship is attested by the Acts of the Apostles and by the Epistles of St. Paul himself; the succession of the Roman primacy from St. Peter is attested by the unbroken tradition of the Universal Church. For an Orthodox Christian the latter evidence is intrinsically of no less value than the former. Of the manner in

which the foundation rock of the Church was removed from Palestine to Italy, we may well be ignorant; but that it was actually so removed and established at Rome is an incontrovertible fact, the rejection of which would involve the denial not only of sacred tradition but of the very history of Christianity.

The point of view which ranks fact lower than principle and lays greater emphasis on a general truth than on the external certainty of material phenomena is by no means peculiar to ourselves; it is the opinion of the Orthodox Church herself Let us quote an example in order to make our meaning clear. It is absolutely certain that the first œcumenical council of Nicæa was summoned by the Emperor Constantine and not by Pope St. Silvester. Nevertheless the Greco-Russian Church in the office of January 2, in which she celebrates the memory of St. Silvester, has accorded to him special praise for having summoned the 318 Fathers to Nicæa and promulgated the orthodox dogma against the blasphemy of Anus. This is no mere historical error — the history of the first council was well known in the Eastern Church — but rather the expression of a general truth far more important for the religious conscience of the Church than material accuracy. Once the primacy of the Popes was recognized in principle, it was natural to ascribe to each Pope all the ecclesiastical acts that took place during his pontificate. Thus with the general fundamental rule of the life of the Church in mind rather than the historical details of a particular event, the Easterns assigned to St. Silvester the privileges and duties which were his according to the spirit, if not the letter, of Christian history. And if it is true that the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life, they were right.

XI

Pope St. Leo the Great on the primacy

THIS is not the place to set forth the whole historical development of the Papacy or to quote the copious testimony borne by Orthodox tradition to the lawfulness of the papal sovereignty in the Universal Church. In order to demonstrate the historical basis of our argument to those of our readers who are not familiar with Church history, it will be enough to dwell upon a single epoch memorable in the history of the Papacy, an epoch which is sufficiently primitive to command the respect of our Orthodox traditionalists and which at the same time stands revealed in the broad daylight of historical knowledge and documentary evidence and so presents no obscurity or ambiguity in its essential outlines. The epoch in question is the middle of the fifth century, the period when the Roman Church had so worthy a representative in Pope St. Leo the Great.

It is interesting for us to note the conception which this Roman pontiff, who is also a recognized saint of the Greco-Russian Church, had of his own authority and how his assertions were received in the Eastern part of the Church.

In one of his sermons, after reminding his hearers that Christ is the only pontiff in the strict sense of the word, St. Leo continues thus; "Now He has not abandoned the care of His flock; and it is from His supreme and eternal authority that we have received the abundant gift of apostolic power and His succor is never absent from His work . . . For that firmness of faith which was commended in the prince of the Apostles is perpetual, and as that which Peter believed on in Christ endures, so does that which Christ established in Peter endure also *(et sicut permanet quod in Christo Petrus credidit, ita permanet quod in Petro Christus instituit)* . . . The dispensation of the truth therefore abides; and the blessed Peter, persevering in the strength of the Rock wherewith he has been endowed, has not abandoned the reins of the Church which he received . . . Thus, if we act or decide justly, if by our daily supplications we obtain aught of the mercy of God, it is the work and the merit of him whose power lives and whose authority prevails in his see." And speaking of the bishops gathered at Rome for the feast of St. Peter, St. Leo says that they have desired to honor by their presence "him whom they know not only to preside in this see (of Rome) but also to be the primate of all the bishops." [1]

---

[1] *Works* (ed. Migne, Paris 1846 etc.), i. 145-7.

In another sermon, after expressing what may be called the fundamental truth of the Church, that in the sphere of the inner life of grace all Christians are priests and kings, but that differences and inequalities are necessary in the outward structure of the mystical body of Christ, St. Leo goes on to say: "And yet out of the whole world Peter alone is chosen to be set above the assembly of all the nations, above all the Apostles and all the Fathers of the Church, to the end that though among God's people there are many priests and many pastors, yet all might be duly governed by Peter, being ultimately governed by Christ. Behold, dearly beloved, how great a share *(magnum consortium)* in His own power was bestowed by the will of God upon this man, and if God willed that the rest of the Apostles should share aught in common with him, yet it was through him that He bestowed whatever He did not withhold from the others . . . *And I say unto thee:* that is to say, as My Father has revealed unto thee My Godhead, so I make known to thee thy pre-eminence; *that thou art Peter:* that is to say, though I am the inviolable Rock, though I am the Corner-stone Who have made both one, though I am the Foundation other than which none can be laid, yet thou also art the Rock strengthened by My might and so sharing in common with Me that which I possess by My own power." [1] "The power of binding and loosing was handed on to the other Apostles also and through them to all the rulers of the Church; but not for nothing was a single individual entrusted with what belongs to all . . . Peter is fortified with the strength of all and the assistance of divine grace is so ordered that the stability bestowed by Christ on Peter is conferred by Peter on the Apostles." [2]

As Peter shares in the sovereign authority of Christ over the Universal Church, so the bishop of Rome who occupies the see of Peter is the living representative of this authority. "Peter does not cease to preside in his see and his *consortium* with the Eternal Pontiff never fails. For that steadfastness with which he was endowed, when he was first made the Rock, by Christ Who is Himself the Rock, has passed to his successors, and wherever any stability is manifest it is beyond doubt the might of the supreme Pastor which is in evidence. Could anyone consider the renown of blessed Peter and yet be ignorant or envious enough to assert that there is any part of the Church which is not guided by his care and strengthened by his succor?" [3] "Though every individual pastor tends his flock with a special care and knows that he must give account of the sheep committed to his charge, nevertheless we alone must share the anxiety of all and our responsibility includes the governance of each individual. For since the whole world has recourse to the see of the blessed Apostle Peter, and since that love towards the Universal Church which was enjoined upon him by our Lord is expected of our administration also,

---

[1] *ibid.,* 149.
[2] *ibid.,* 151-2; cf. 429-32.
[3] *ibid.,* 155-156.

therefore the greater our responsibility towards all the faithful, the heavier is the burden which weighs upon us?" [1]

The renown of St. Peter is to St. Leo's mind inseparable from the renown of the Roman Church, which he calls "the holy nation, the chosen people, the priestly and royal state, which has become the head of the world through the blessed Peter's holy see." [2] "He, the chief of the apostolic band, was appointed to the citadel of the Roman Empire that the light of the truth which was being revealed for the salvation of all the nations might spread more effectually from the head itself throughout the whole body of the world." [3]

[1] *ibid.,* 153.
[2] *ibid.,* 423.
[3] *ibid.,* 424.

XII

St. Leo the Great on papal authority

BELIEVING as he did that the supreme authority of Peter resided permanently in the Roman Church, St. Leo could not regard himself otherwise than as "the ruler of the Christian world" [1] responsible for the peace and good order of all the Churches.[2] Constant attention to this huge task was for him a religious obligation. "The demands of religious duty *(ratio pietatis),*" he writes to the African bishops, "require that we should make every effort to ascertain the exact state of affairs with that solicitude which, according to the divine command, we owe to the Universal Church . . . For the stability and order of the Lord's whole household would be disturbed if there were lacking in the head aught of which the body had need." [3] The same ideas are found expressed in a more developed form in his letter to the bishops of Sicily: "We are urged by divine precepts and apostolic exhortations to keep a loving and active watch over the state of all the Churches and if there is anything deserving of blame we must be diligent to warn the culprit either against the rashness of ignorance or the presumption of self-aggrandizement. Constrained by the Lord's utterance which urged upon blessed Peter the mystical injunction, thrice repeated, that he who loves Christ should feed Christ's sheep, we are bound by reverence for his see, which by the abundance of divine grace we occupy, to avoid the peril of sloth so far as we may, lest the confession of the holy Apostle, whereby he declared himself the Lord's disciple, be required of us in vain. For he who is negligent in feeding the flock so repeatedly entrusted to him is proved to have no love for the Chief Shepherd." [4]

In his letter to St. Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, the Pope assigns to himself the task of preserving the Catholic faith intact by cutting off all dissensions, of warning by his own authority *(nostra auctoritate)* the champions of error, and of fortifying those whose faith is approved.[5]

When the Emperor Theodosius II attempted to plead with St. Leo on behalf of the archimandrite Eutyches who was the author of the Monophysite heresy, the

---

[1] The designation given him in the Constitution of the Emperor Valentinian III; *v. Works* i. 637.
[2] *ibid.*, 664.
[3] *ibid.,* 646.
[4] *ibid.,* 695-6.
[5] *ibid.,* 733.

sovereign pontiff replied that Eutyches could secure pardon if he recanted the opinions condemned by the Pope, with whom lay the final decision in questions of dogma. "What the Catholic Church believes and teaches on the mystery of the Lord's incarnation is contained fully in the letter sent to my brother and fellow-bishop Flavian." [1]

St. Leo did not admit that the œcumenical council had any power of decision on a dogma already defined by the Pope.[2] In the instructions which the Pope gives to his legate, the Bishop Paschasinus, he points to his dogmatic epistle to Flavian as the complete and final definition of the true faith.[3] In another letter to the Emperor Marcian, St. Leo declares himself instructed by the Spirit of God to teach and impart the true Catholic faith.[4] In a third letter to the Emperor, he states that he has only asked for the summoning of a council in order to restore peace in the Eastern Church,[5] and in the letter addressed to the council itself he says that he only accepts it "so that the rights and dignity belonging to the see of the blessed Apostle Peter be respected," and he urges the Eastern bishops "to abstain entirely from the rashness of impugning the divinely inspired faith," as he has defined it in his dogmatic epistle. "It is not permitted," he writes, "to defend that which it is not permitted to believe, since in our letters sent to Bishop Flavian of blessed memory we have already with the greatest fullness and lucidity *(plenissime et lucidissime)* expounded the true and pure faith concerning the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in accordance with the authoritative record of the Gospels, the words of the Prophets and the teaching of the Apostles." [6] And in the following words St. Leo informs the Gaulish bishops of the result of the council of Chalcedon: "The holy Synod, adhering with religious unanimity to that which had been written by our unworthy hand and reinforced by the authority and merit of my lord, the blessed Apostle Peter, has cut off from the Church of God this shameful abomination" (the heresy of Eutyches and Dioscorus).[7]

But it is well known that, besides this result which the Pope approved, the council of Chalcedon was marked by an act of a different kind. In an irregular session, the Eastern bishops subject to the patriarch of Constantinople promulgated the famous twenty-eighth Canon by which they conferred upon their metropolitan the primacy of the East to the prejudice of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. It is true that they themselves declared the Canon to be provisional and humbly submitted it to the judgment of St. Leo, who repudiated it with indignation

---

[1] *ibid.,* 783.
[2] *ibid.,* 918: Letter to the Emperor Marcian.
[3] *ibid.,* 927.
[4] *ibid.,* 930.
[5] *ibid.,* 932.
[6] *ibid.,* 937-9.
[7] *ibid.,* 987.

and seized this fresh opportunity of defining his conception of the hierarchy and the extent of his own authority. In his letter to the Emperor, he observes in the first place that the claims of the patriarch of Constantinople are based upon political considerations and have nothing in common with the primacy of St. Peter which is of divine institution. "Secular things stand upon a different footing from things divine; and apart from the one Rock which the Lord has laid for a foundation, no building can be stable . . . Let it suffice him" (the patriarch Anatolius) "that he has obtained the bishopric of so great a city with the aid of your piety and the support of my favor. He should not disdain the royal city, even though he cannot change it into an apostolic see; and let him on no account hope to succeed in exalting his own position at the expense of others . . . Let him remember that it is to me that the government of the Church has been entrusted. I should be responsible if the rules of the Church were infringed through my acquiescence (far be it from me!) or if the will of a single brother had more weight with me than the common good of the Lord's whole house." [1] "The agreements of the bishops which are contrary to the holy canons of Nicæa . . . we declare to be null and void, and by the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter we annul them completely by a general decree." [2] In his reply to the petition of the bishops of the fourth council, the Pope confirms his approval of their dogmatic decree (formulated on the lines of his own letter to Flavian) as well as his annulment of the twenty-eighth Canon. "Your Holiness will be able," he writes, "to appreciate the reverence with which the Apostolic See observes the rules of the holy Fathers, by reading my writings in which I have rejected the claims of the bishop of Constantinople; and you will understand that I am, with the help of the Lord, the guardian of the Catholic faith and of the decrees of the Fathers." [3]

Although St. Leo, as we have just seen, did not think an œcumenical council necessary in the interests of dogmatic truth after the definitions contained in his letter, yet he considered it very desirable for the peace of the Church; and the spontaneous and unanimous adherence of the council to his decrees filled him with joy. In such a voluntary unity he saw the ideal relationship within the hierarchy. "The merit of the priestly office," he writes to Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, "gains great luster where the authority of those in command is so maintained that the liberty of those under obedience appears in no way diminished." [4] "The Lord has. not allowed us to suffer harm in the person of our brethren, but what He had already laid down through our ministry He subsequently confirmed by the irrevocable assent of the whole brotherhood to show that it was indeed from

[1] *ibid.,* 995.
[2] *ibid.,* 1000.
[3] *ibid.,* 1027 *sqq.*
[4] *ibid.,* 1048.

Himself that 'the dogmatic act' proceeded which was first promulgated by the chief of all sees and then received by the judgment of the whole Christian world so that in this also the members might be in agreement with the head." [1]

The learned Theodoret, as is well known, had been accused of Nestorianism, but had been exculpated at the council of Chalcedon; he himself, however, regarded this judgment as only provisional and applied to the Pope for a final decision. St. Leo pronounced him orthodox "in the name of our blessed God Whose invincible truth has shown thee to be clean from all stain of heresy according to the judgment of the Apostolic See;" and he adds: "We acknowledge the exceeding care of blessed Peter for us all, who not only has confirmed the judgment of his see in the definition of the faith, but has also vindicated those who were unjustly condemned." [2]

But while he recognized in voluntary agreement the ideal of ecclesiastical unity, St. Leo clearly distinguished in this unity the element of authority from the element of deliberation, the decision of the Holy See from the consent of the œcumenical council. The ideal of the Church requires such consent on the part of the whole brotherhood; the life of the Church is incomplete without an entire unanimity; but even this universal consent has no real basis and can produce no result without the decisive action of the central authority, as the history of the Church abundantly proves. The last word in all questions of dogma and the final confirmation of every ecclesiastical act belongs to the see of St. Peter. Hence, in his letter to Anatolius, the patriarch of Constantinople, regarding a cleric of that city, Atticus, who was to recant his heretical opinions and submit himself to the judgment of the fourth council, St. Leo draws an essential distinction between his own part in the decisions of the ecumenical council and the part played by the Greek patriarch: "He" (*i. e.,* Atticus) "must promise to maintain in all points the definition of faith of the council of Chalcedon to which your charity has assented and subscribed and which has been confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See." [3]

The fundamental principle of Church government could not be better formulated than by drawing St. Leo's distinction between the authority which confirms and the charity which assents. It is assuredly no mere primacy of honor that the Pope claims in these words. On the contrary, St. Leo allows a complete equality of honor among all bishops; from that point of view all were for him brethren and fellow-bishops. It was, on the other hand, the distinction of power which he explicitly asserted. The brotherhood of all does not exclude for him the authority of one. In a letter to Anastasius, bishop of Salonica, on certain matters which "have been

[1] *ibid.,* 1046-7.
[2] *ibid.,* 1053.
[3] *ibid.,* 1147.

entrusted to his brotherly care by the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter," [1] he sums up the conception of the hierarchical principle thus: "Even among the blessed Apostles, there was side by side with an equality of honor a distinction of authority; and though all were equally chosen, nevertheless pre-eminence was given to one over the others. On the same principle, distinction is made between bishops, and the mighty design of Providence has ordered it that all may not claim every prerogative, but that in each province there should be someone possessing primacy of jurisdiction" (literally: "prime judgment") "over his brethren; and again that those presiding in the larger cities should receive a wider responsibility, that through them the care of the Universal Church might ultimately rest upon the one see of Peter and that no part should anywhere be separated from the head." [2]

The ultimate warrant and sanction of this "mighty design of Providence" consists, according to St. Leo, in the fact that the one head of the Church, with whom the rights and obligations of all are bound up, does not owe his power to the ordinance of man or to the accidents of history, but represents the impregnable rock of truth and justice laid down by the Lord Himself as the foundation of His social structure. It is no mere consideration of expediency, but the *ratio pietatis* which is invoked by him who has received the government of the whole Church *e divina institutione.*[3]

[1] *ibid.,* 668.
[2] *ibid.,* 676.
[3] *ibid.,* 646.

XIII

The approval of St. Leo's ideas by the Greek Fathers.
The "robber council" of Ephesus

IN the writings and acts of Leo I we see no longer the germ of the sovereign Papacy, but the Papacy itself exhibiting the full extent of its powers. To mention only the most important point, the doctrine of infallibility *ex cathedra* is here proclaimed fourteen centuries before Pius IX. Saint Leo asserts that the authority of St. Peter's Chair is of itself sufficient to resolve a fundamental question of dogma, and he does not ask the ecumenical council to define the dogma but to assent, for the sake of the peace of the Church, to the definition given by the Pope who is by divine right the lawful guardian of the true Catholic faith. If this thesis, which was merely developed by the Vatican council in its *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia Christi,* is a heresy as our own theologians have claimed, then Pope St. Leo the Great is a declared heretic or rather a heresiarch, since never before had this thesis been affirmed so explicitly, so forcibly or so insistently.

Let us see, then, the kind of reception which the Orthodox Church gave to the authoritative assertions of Pope St. Leo; for this purpose we will take the acts of those Greek councils which were contemporary with this Pope and read the documents.[1] We find, first of all, a remarkable letter from the bishop Peter Chrysologus to the archimandrite Eutyches. When St. Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, had in conjunction with his synod condemned Eutyches, archimandrite of one of the monasteries of the Greek capital, for heresy, and had applied to the Pope for confirmation of the sentence, Eutyches, following the advice given him at the Emperor's court, where he had many influential patrons, attempted to win certain orthodox bishops to his side. The following is the reply he received from one of them, Peter Chrysologus: "Above all, we advise you, venerable brother, to adhere with the greatest confidence to the writings of the blessed Pope of the city of Rome; since the blessed Apostle Peter, who lives and presides in his own see, gives to those who seek it the truth of the faith. As for us, our anxiety for peace and for the faith forbids us to decide causes which concern religion without the assent of the bishop of Rome." [2]

[1] Mansi, *Concil.,* vols. v., vi. and vii.
[2] Mansi, *Concil.,* V. 1349.

Peter Chrysologus, though a Greek and writing to a Greek, was nevertheless bishop of Ravenna and therefore half Western. But a few pages further on we find the same doctrine from the representative of the metropolis of the East, Flavian, a saint and confessor of the Orthodox Church. On the heresy of Eutyches he writes thus to the Pope: “The whole question needs only your single decision and all will be settled in peace and quietness. Your sacred letter will, with God’s help, completely suppress the heresy which has arisen and the disturbance which it has caused;[1] and so,” he continues, “the convening of a council, which is, in any case, difficult, will be rendered superfluous.”

Next to the saintly patriarch of Constantinople should be quoted the learned bishop of Cyrus, Theodoret, who has been beatified by the Greek Church. “If Paul, the herald of the truth and the trumpet of the Holy Spirit,” he writes to Pope Leo, “had recourse to the great Peter, we, simple and humble as we are, ought all the more to hasten to your apostolic throne to receive at your hands healing for the wounds which afflict the Churches. For the primacy belongs to you for every reason. Your see is adorned with every sort of privilege and, above all, with that of faith; to which the divine Apostle bears sufficient witness when, in addressing the Church of Rome, he exclaims: ‘Your faith is spoken of in the whole world.’ It is your see which possesses the tombs of the fathers and doctors of the truth, Peter and Paul, enlightening the souls of the faithful. That divine and thrice-blessed pair appeared in the East and shed their rays abroad; but it was in the West that they chose to be delivered from this life and it is from thence that they now illumine the whole world. They have shed manifest luster upon your throne and that is the crown of your b1essings.” [2] “As for me, I have only to await the sentence of your apostolic see. And I beg and beseech your Holiness to give me, who am unjustly accused, access to your lawful and just tribunal; give but the word and I hasten to receive from you my doctrine in which I have only desired to follow in the Apostles’ footsteps.” [3]

These are no mere empty words or rhetorical phrases addressed to the Pope by the representatives of orthodoxy. The Greek bishops had cause enough to cling to the supreme authority of the Apostolic See. The “robber council of Ephesus” had just given them ocular demonstration of what an œcumenical council without the Pope could be like. It is instructive to recall the circumstances of that occasion.

Since the fourth century, that part of the Church which was mainly Greek in culture had suffered from the rivalry and continual strife of two central sees, the ancient patriarchate of Alexandria and the new one of Constantinople. The outward fluctuations in this struggle depended mainly on the attitude of the Byzantine

[1] *ibid.,* 1356.
[2] *ibid.,* vi. 36, 37.
[3] *ibid.,* 40.

court; and if we look into the causes which influenced the attitude of the secular power to the two ecclesiastical centers of the East, we note a remarkable fact. *A priori* it might be supposed that the Byzantine Empire had, from the political point of view, three lines of action from which to choose: she might support the new patriarchate of Constantinople as her own creation, always within her control and unable to achieve any permanent independence; or else imperialist Byzantium might wish to avoid the necessity of repressing centralist tendencies at home and, in order to rid herself of a rather too close and irksome connection, she might prefer to have the center of ecclesiastical administration somewhere farther off and yet within her sphere of influence; she might, with this end in view, incline to support the patriarchate of Alexandria which satisfied both these conditions and besides could claim, on traditional and canonical grounds, a relative primacy over the East; or, lastly, the imperial government might choose to maintain an even balance between the rival sees by favoring now one and now the other according to political circumstances. It is clear, however, that actually none of these courses was chosen. When ample allowance has been made for individual coincidences or purely personal reactions, it must still be recognized that there was a general motive dictating the policy of the Byzantine Emperors in the struggle between the great sees of the East; but the motive lay outside the three political considerations just indicated. If the Emperors varied in their attitude to the two patriarchates, alternately giving first one and then the other their support, this variation had nothing to do with the balance of power; the Byzantine court invariably supported, not the one of the two rival prelates who was least dangerous at the moment, but the one who was in the wrong from the religious or moral point of view. It was enough for a patriarch, whether of Constantinople or of Alexandria, to be a heretic or an unworthy shepherd of his flock, and he was assured of the active protection of the Empire for a considerable period, if not for the rest of his career. And, conversely, a saint or a champion of orthodoxy who ascended the episcopal throne, either in the city of Alexander or in that of Constantine, might count at once upon the hatred and persecution of the imperial court and often upon nothing short of martyrdom.

This invincible tendency of the Byzantine government towards injustice, violence and heresy and its ineradicable antipathy to the worthiest representatives of the Christian hierarchy, was quick to show itself. Scarcely had the Empire recognized the Christian religion before it was already persecuting St. Athanasius, the light of orthodoxy. The whole of the long reign of Constantius, the son of Constantine the Great, was taken up with the struggle against the renowned patriarch of Alexandria, while the heretical bishops of Constantinople were backed by the Emperor. Nor was it the power of the see of Alexandria which was intolerable to the Christian Cæsar, but the moral greatness of its occupant. Half a

century later the position was reversed and the see of Constantinople was occupied by a great saint, John Chrysostom, while the patriarchate of Alexandria had fallen to Theophilus, a man of the most contemptible character; but the court of Byzantium favored Theophilus and used every means in its power to bring about Chrysostom's downfall. It may be said, however, that it was merely the independent character of the great Christian orator which made him suspect in imperial circles. Yet, not long afterwards, the Church of Constantinople was ruled by Nestorius, a personality of an equally courageous and independent character; but since he possessed the additional qualification of being a determined propagator of heresy, he received every encouragement from Theodosius II and could count on the Emperor's unfailing support in his struggle against St. Cyril, the new patriarch of Alexandria and the rival of the great Athanasius, if not in personal character, at least in his zeal for orthodoxy and his theological ability. We shall see before long why the imperial government did not succeed in upholding the heretic Nestorius and bringing about the fall of St. Cyril. Shortly afterwards the position was again reversed: the patriarchate of Constantinople had in St. Flavian a worthy successor of John Chrysostom, and the see of Alexandria was now held by a second Theophilus, one Dioscorus, nicknamed "the Pharaoh of Egypt." Saint Flavian was a gentle and unassuming person; Dioscorus' character, on the other hand, was stained with every wickedness and was distinguished mainly by an inordinate ambition and a despotic temper to which he owed his nickname. From the purely political point of view, it was obvious that the imperial government had nothing to fear from St. Flavian, while the domineering ambitions of the new "Pharaoh" might well arouse justifiable apprehensions. But St. Flavian was orthodox, and Dioscorus had the great merit of favoring the new heresy of Monophysitism. That alone was enough to ensure him the support of the Byzantine court[1] and an œcumenical council was summoned under imperial auspices to give official sanction to his cause. Dioscorus had everything in his favor: the support of the secular arm, a well-disciplined body of clergy brought with him from Egypt and blindly devoted to him, a mob of heretical monks, a considerable following among the clergy of the other patriarchates, and, lastly, the cowardice of the majority of the orthodox bishops, who dared not offer open resistance to a heresy which enjoyed the favor of "the sacred majesty of Divus Augustus." Saint Flavian was condemned unheard, and his fall must have involved the collapse of orthodoxy throughout the Eastern Church — had that Church been left to her own resources. But there was, outside that Church, a religious and moral authority with which the

[1] A curious fact and one which strikingly confirms our theory of the partiality of the Byzantine Emperors for heresy *as such* is that the same Emperor Theodosius II, who had favored the Nestorian heresy and had seen it condemned by the Church in spite of his efforts, became subsequently the enthusiastic supporter of Eutyches and Dioscorus who held the view diametrically opposite to that of Nestorius, though no less heretical.

“Pharaohs” and the Emperors had to reckon. Though in the struggle between the two Eastern patriarchates the Byzantine court always took the side of injustice and heresy, yet the cause of justice and orthodoxy, whether maintained by Alexandria or Constantinople, never failed to find vigorous support in the Apostolic See of Rome. The contrast is, indeed, striking. It is the Emperor Constantius who ruthlessly persecutes St. Athanasius; it is Pope Julius who takes his part and defends him against the whole East. It is Pope Innocent who makes energetic protest against the persecution of St. John Chrysostom and, after the death of the saint, takes the first step towards the rehabilitation of his memory in the Church. Again, it is Pope Celestine who backs St. Cyril with all the weight of his authority in his courageous struggle against the heresy of Nestorius and its political champions; and there can be no doubt that without the aid of the Apostolic See the patriarch of Alexandria, for all his energy, would not have succeeded in overcoming the combined forces of the imperial power and the greater part of the Greek clergy. This contrast between the policy of the Empire and that of the Papacy may be observed right through the history of the Eastern heresies, which were not only invariably supported, but sometimes even invented, by the Emperors, as the Monothelite heresy was by the Emperor Heraclius and the Iconoclastic heresy by Leo the Isaurian. But we must pause at the fifth century over the struggle of the two patriarchates and the instructive history of the “robber council” of Ephesus.

Repeated experience had proved that, in the quarrel between the two princes of the Eastern Church, the Western Pope showed no bias or partiality, but invariably gave his support to the cause of justice and truth. Accordingly, the tyrant and heretic Dioscorus could not count on Rome for the same assistance that his predecessor St. Cyril had received. His plan was to secure primacy over the whole Eastern Church by the condemnation of St. Flavian and the triumph of the Egyptian faction, more or less Monophysite, of which he himself was the leader. Realizing that there was no hope of the Pope’s consent being given to such a plan, he resolved to achieve his object without the Pope or, if necessary, in spite of him.

In 449 a council which was œcumenical in its composition assembled at Ephesus. The whole Eastern Church was represented. The legates of Pope St. Leo were also present, but were not allowed to preside over the council. Dioscorus, guarded by the imperial officers and attended by his Egyptian bishops and a mob of clerics armed with staves, presided like a king holding court. The bishops of the orthodox party were cowed and silent. “All of them,” we read in the *Russian Martyrology* (“Life of St. Flavian”), “loved darkness rather than light and preferred falsehood to truth, desiring rather to please their earthly king than the King of Heaven.” Saint Flavian had to submit to a farcical trial. Some of the bishops threw themselves at Dioscorus’ feet and implored his indulgence for the accused. They

were roughly handled by the Egyptians amid deafening cries of "Hack asunder those who would divide Christ!" The orthodox bishops were given tablets on which nothing was written and to which they were compelled to put their signatures, knowing that a heretical formula would be immediately inscribed upon them. The majority signed without a murmur. A few desired to sign with certain reservations, but the Egyptian clergy tore the tablets from their hands, breaking their fingers with blows from their staves. Finally, Dioscorus rose and, in the name of the council, pronounced sentence of condemnation against Flavian, who was deposed, excommunicated and handed over to the secular arm. Flavian tried to protest, but Dioscorus' clerics fell on him and handled him so roughly that he died within two days.

When injustice, violence and falsehood thus reigned supreme in an œcumenical council, where was the infallible and inviolable Church of Christ? It was present and, moreover, gave proof of its presence. At the moment when St. Flavian was being done to death by the brutalities of Dioscorus' minions, when the heretical bishops were loudly acclaiming the triumph of their leader, while the orthodox bishops stood by trembling and silent, Hilary, the deacon of the Roman Church, cried: "Contradicitur!" [1] At that moment it was certainly not the cowering, silent crowd of orthodox Easterns which represented the Church of God. All the immortal power of the Church was concentrated for Eastern Christendom in that simple legal word spoken by the Roman deacon: *contradicitur.* We are accustomed to find fault with the distinctively juridical and legalistic character of the Western Church; and no doubt the principles and formu1æ of Roman law do not hold good in the Kingdom of God. But the "robber council" of Ephesus was an express vindication of Latin justice. The *contradicitur* of the Roman deacon was the symbol of principle against fact, of right against brute force, of unshakeable moral stability against victorious wickedness on the one hand, and cowardice on the other; it was, in a word, the impregnable Rock of the Church against the gates of Hell.

The murderers of the patriarch of Constantinople did not dare to touch the deacon of the Roman Church. And in the short space of two years the *contradicitur* of Rome had changed "the most holy œcumenical council of Ephesus" into "the robber council of Ephesus," had ousted the mitered assassin, decreed the canonization of his victim, and brought about the assembling of the true œcumenical council of Chalcedon under the presidency of the Roman legates.

[1] Mansi, vi. 908.

XIV

The Council of Chalcedon

THE central authority of the Universal Church is the impregnable foundation of social justice because it is the infallible organ of religious truth. Pope Leo had a twofold task to accomplish: he had not only to re-establish in the Christian East the moral order which had been subverted by the misdeeds of the patriarch of Alexandria, but also to confirm his Eastern brethren in the true faith which was threatened by the heresy of Monophysitism. The distinctive truth of Christianity, the truth of the God-Man, was at stake. The Monophysites, in asserting that the humanity of Jesus Christ was entirely absorbed by His divinity and that, therefore, after the incarnation He was God alone, were reverting, unconsciously, no doubt, to the inhuman God of Eastern paganism, the God Who devours all that He has created and is nothing but an abyss unfathomable to the human spirit. Their assertion was ultimately a disguised denial of any permanent revelation or incarnation, but it took shelter behind the great theological reputation of St. Cyril, who, in vindicating against Nestorius the unity of the person of Jesus Christ, had let fall from his pen an inaccurate phrase: Μία φύσις του Θεου Λογου σεσαρκωμένη (one incarnate nature of God the Word). And just because the denial of the faith was so disguised, it was necessary to find a new formula to express in clear and precise terms the truth of the Divine Humanity. The whole orthodox world was awaiting such a formula from the successor of St. Peter. Pope Leo himself was profoundly aware of the importance of the question. "Jesus Christ, the Savior of mankind," he says, "in founding the faith which recalls the wicked to righteousness and the dead to life, instilled into the minds of His disciples the exhortations of His teaching and the marvels of His works, that the one Christ might be acknowledged both as the Only-begotten of God and as the Son of Man. For one belief without the other was of no avail to salvation, and it was equally perilous to believe the Lord Jesus Christ to be God alone and not Man, or to be Man alone and not God" — since the former belief places Him out of reach of our infirmity and the latter makes Him unable to effect our salvation — "but both were to be confessed, for just as true humanity existed in the Godhead, so true Divinity existed in the manhood. In order, therefore, to confirm them in their most wholesome *(saluberrimam)* knowledge of this faith, the Lord had questioned His

disciples: and the Apostle Peter, surpassing the things of the body and transcending human knowledge by the revelation of the Spirit of the Father, beheld with the eyes of his mind the Son of the living God and acknowledged the glory of the Godhead because he did not look merely at the substance of flesh and blood. And Christ so approved the sublime faith of Peter that He pronounced him blessed and endowed him with the sacred stability of the inviolable Rock on which the Church should be built to prevail against the gates of Hell and the jaws of death; so that in the decision of all causes nothing shall be ratified in Heaven but that which has been established by the judgment of Peter." [1]

Claiming, as he does, that the primary function of the authority of the Church — that of asserting and defining Christian truth — belongs for all time to the Chair of St. Peter, which he occupies, Leo considers it his duty to combat the new heresy by expounding anew the confession of the Apostle. In penning his famous dogmatic epistle to Flavian, he regards himself as the inspired interpreter of the prince of the Apostles; and the whole orthodox East regarded him in the same light. In the *Leimonarion*[2] of St. Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem in the seventh century, we find the following legend: When St. Leo had written his epistle to St. Flavian, the bishop of Constantinople, against the impious Eutyches and Nestorius, he placed it upon the tomb of the chief Apostle Peter and with prayers, vigils and fasts he entreated the sovereign Apostle in these words: "If, in the frailty of human nature, I have been guilty of error, do thou, to whom Jesus Christ our Savior, Lord and God has entrusted this throne and the whole Church, supply every defect in what I have written and remove all that is superfluous." After forty days had elapsed, the Apostle appeared to him while he was praying and said: "I have read and corrected it." And, taking up his epistle from the tomb of blessed Peter, Leo opened it and found it corrected by the Apostle's hand.[3]

This epistle, truly worthy of such a reviser, defined with wonderful clearness and vigor the truth of the two natures in the one person of Christ and thenceforth left no place in the Church for the two opposite errors of Nestorius and Eutyches. The fact that St. Leo's epistle was not read at the robber council of Ephesus was the main reason urged for the quashing of the decrees of the pseudo-council. Though Dioscorus had succeeded in coercing the entire gathering of Eastern bishops into condemning St. Flavian and putting their names to a heretical document, he encountered unexpected opposition when he ventured on open rebellion against the Pope. For the latter, on receiving from his legates news of what had passed at Ephesus, at once convened a council of Latin bishops at Rome, and with their unanimous approval condemned and deposed Dioscorus. The

---

[1] *Works* (ed. Migne), i. 309.
[2] A kind of chrestomathy composed of edifying stories.
[3] *v.* the life of St. Leo the Pope in the *Russian Martyrology*.

“Pharaoh,” who had returned to Alexandria in triumph, attempted to outwit the Pope; he was soon to realize that it was no mere empty self-aggrandizement with which he was confronted, but a living spiritual authority which claimed the allegiance of the Christian conscience throughout the world. The pride and effrontery of the usurping bishop were shattered upon the true Rock of the Church; employing all his customary methods of violence, he succeeded in compelling only ten Egyptian bishops to lend their names to the condemnation of Pope Leo.[1] Even in the East this futile insult was universally regarded as an act of insanity, and it proved the final undoing of the Egyptian “Pharaoh.”

The Emperor Theodosius II, the champion of the two opposite heresies and the patron of both Nestorius and Dioscorus, had just died, and with the accession of Pulcheria and her nominal consort, Marcian, there began a short phase during which the imperial government, apparently from religious conviction, ranged itself decisively upon the side of truth. In the East this alone was enough to restore courage to the orthodox bishops and to enlist on the side of the true faith which the new Emperor professed all those who had only sided with heresy to please his predecessor. But the orthodox Emperor himself had little confidence in these pliant prelates. For him, supreme authority in matters of faith belonged to the Pope. “In all that concerns the Catholic religion and the faith of Christians,” we read in a letter of his to St. Leo, “we have thought it right to approach, in the first place, your Holiness, who is the overseer and guardian of the divine faith (την τε σην άγιωσύνην επισκοπεύουσαν και αρχουσαν τες θείας πίστεως)[2] According to the Emperor’s view, it is by the Pope’s authority (σου αυθεντουντος) that the forthcoming council must banish all impiety and error from the Church and establish perfect peace among all the bishops of the Catholic faith.[3] And in another letter, which follows close upon the first, the Emperor asserts again that the duty of the council will be to acknowledge and expound for the East what the Pope has decreed at Rome.[4] The Empress Pulcheria uses the same language in her assurance to the Pope that the council “will define the Catholic belief by your authority (σου αυθεντουντος), as Christian faith and piety require.”[5]

When the œcumenical council had assembled at Chalcedon in 451 under the presidency of the Roman legates, the bishop Paschasinus, who was the principal legate, rose and said: “We bear instructions from the blessed and apostolic bishop of the city of Rome, who is the head of all the Churches, forbidding us to admit

---

[1] Mansi, vi. 510.
[2] *ibid.,* 93.
[3] *loc. cit.*
[4] *ibid.,* 100.
[5] *ibid.,* 101.

Dioscorus to the deliberations of the council." [1] And the second legate, Lucentius, explained that Dioscorus was already condemned for having usurped judicial powers and having assembled a council without the consent of the Apostolic See, a thing which had never happened before and was forbidden (όπερ ουδέποτε γέγονεν ουδε εξον γενέσθαι).[2] After considerable discussion, the Emperor's representatives announced that Dioscorus would not sit as a member of the council, but would appear as an accused man, since he had incurred accusation on fresh counts subsequently to his condemnation by the Pope.[3] Judgment upon him was withheld until after the reading of the Pope's dogmatic epistle, which was hailed by the orthodox bishops with shouts of: "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo!" [4] In the following session, several clergy of the Church of Alexandria presented a petition addressed "to the most holy Leo, beloved of God, universal archbishop and patriarch of great Rome, and to the holy œcumenica1 council at Chalcedon." It was a bill of accusation against Dioscorus who, the complainants alleged, after ratifying heresy in a council of brigands and murdering St. Flavian, "attempted a still greater wickedness," the excommunication of the most holy and sacred Apostolic See of great Rome.[5] The council did not think itself competent to pass fresh judgment on a bishop whom the Pope had already judged, and it was proposed that the Roman legates should pronounce judgment on Dioscorus.[6] Accordingly they did so, having first enumerated all the crimes of the patriarch of Alexandria in these terms: "The most holy and blessed archbishop of great and old Rome, Leo, through us and the holy council here present, and together with the thrice blessed and most glorious Apostle Peter, who is the Rock and base of the Catholic Church and the foundation of the orthodox faith, has deprived the said Dioscorus of episcopal status and expelled him entirely from his priestly office." [7]

The solemn recognition of the Pope's supreme authority at the council of Chalcedon was sealed by the letter of the Eastern bishops to Leo, in which they impute to him the merit of all that had been done at the council. "It is you," they wrote, "who through your legates have guided and ruled (ήγεμόνευες) the whole gathering of the Fathers, as the head rules the members (ώς κεφαλη μελων), by showing them the true meaning of the dogma." [8] It is clear that to reject the supremacy and doctrinal authority of the Roman See as usurped and false involves not merely a charge of usurpation and heresy against a man of the character of St.

[1] *ibid.,* 580-1.
[2] *ibid.,* 645.
[3] *loc. cit.*
[4] *ibid.,* 972.
[5] *ibid.,* 1005-9.
[6] *ibid.,* 1045.
[7] *ibid.,* 1048.
[8] *ibid.,* 148.

Leo the Great; it means accusing the œcumenical council of Chalcedon of heresy and with it the whole Orthodox Church of the fifth century. This is the conclusion that emerges unmistakably from the authentic evidence which the reader has had set before him.

PART THREE

THE TRINITARY PRINCIPLE AND ITS SOCIAL APPLICATION

I

The Divine Trinity rationally deduced from the idea of Being

THE true Church — the Temple, Body and mystical Spouse of God — is, like God Himself, one. But there is unity and unity. There is a negative, solitary and barren unity, which is limited to the exclusion of all plurality. This unity is mere negation, which logically presupposes what it denies and appears as the beginning, arbitrarily arrested, of an indeterminate number. For there is nothing to prevent the reason from admitting several simple and equal unities and then multiplying them to infinity. And if the Germans are right in naming such a process "evil infinity" *(die schlechte Unendlichkeit),*[1] the simple unity which is its opposite is not opposed to plurality and does not exclude it, but in the serene enjoyment of its own superiority dominates its opposite and subjects it to its own laws. Evil unity is void and nothingness; true unity is that of the one being which contains all in itself. This positive and pregnant unity principle may well be described as "evil unity." But there is a true unity which,while always remaining itself above all limited and manifold reality, includes, determines and reveals the living powers, the uniform reasons and the varied qualities of all that exists. It is with a confession of this perfect unity, producing and embracing all, that the Christian Creed begins: *in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem* (παντοκράτορα).

This characteristic of positive unity (uni-totality or uni-plenitude) belongs to all that is, or must be, absolute of its kind. Such is, in Himself, God Almighty; such, ideally, is the human reason which is able to comprehend everything; such, lastly, must be the true Church which is essentially universal, that is to say, embraces mankind and the whole world in its living unity.

Truth is one and unique in the sense that there cannot be two truths absolutely independent of one another, still less contrary to one another. But in virtue of this very unity, the one truth, incapable of containing within itself anything limited, arbitrary or exclusive, or of being partial or incomplete, must comprise within a logical system the reasons of all that exists and must suffice to explain everything. So, too, is the true Church one and unique in the sense that there cannot be two true Churches independent of one another, still less in conflict with one another. But for

[1] In German, *schlecht* (evil) and *schlicht* (simple) are really one and the same word, a fact which gave Hegel his opportunity for the pun which has had such a success in Germanic philosophy. Aristotle had indeed already expounded the same idea, without the play upon words.

that very reason the true Church, as the unique organization of the divine-human life, must embrace in an actual system all the fullness of our existence and must define all the duties of man, meet all his true needs and answer to all his aspirations.

The actual unity of the Church is represented and secured by the ecclesiastical monarchy. But since the Church, being one, must therefore be universal, that is to say, must embrace all in a determinate order, the ecclesiastical monarchy cannot remain barren but must engender all the powers that go to make up human society in its fullness. And if the monarchy of Peter, considered as such, affords us a reflection of the divine unity and at the same time a real and indispensable basis for the progressive unification of mankind, we shall see also in the further development of the social powers of Christendom not only a reflection of the immanent fecundity of the Godhead, but also a real means of linking the totality of human existence to the fullness of the divine life.

In saying that a living being *is,* we inevitably ascribe to it at once unity, duality and trinity. There is unity because we are dealing with a single being. There is duality because we cannot affirm that a being *is,* without at the same time affirming that it is something, that it has a determinate objectivity. The two fundamental categories of all being are therefore (1) its existence as a real subject, and (2) its objective essence or its idea (its *raison d'être*). Finally, there is trinity: the subject of the living being is linked in three different ways to its essential objectivity; it possesses it in the first place by the very fact of its existence, as its own intimate nature or actuality; it possesses it in the second place in its activity which is necessarily the manifestation of this substance; finally, it possesses it in the awareness or enjoyment of its own being and activity, in that return upon itself which proceeds from existence manifested in activity. The presence of these three modes of existence, successively if not simultaneously, is absolutely essential to the constitution of a living being. For if it goes without saying that activity and awareness imply the real existence of a given subject, it is no less certain that a reality entirely incapable of either would be, not a living being, but an inert and lifeless thing.

There can be no question that, considered in themselves, the three modes of being just indicated have a quite positive character. As a really existing subject is more than a logical abstraction, so an acting and conscious subject is more than inert matter or blind force. But in the natural order, among all created beings, the constituent modes of complete existence are never found in their pure form; they are inseparable from certain limitations and negations which profoundly modify their positive character. Indeed, if the created living being enjoys real existence, it never possesses it as an absolute and primary fact; its reality derives from an external cause, it is not self-contained. So, too, the proper activity of a created

being is never purely, simply and solely the manifestation of its inner being, but it is necessarily determined by the concurrence of circumstances and the influence of external stimuli, or at least complicated by the logical possibility of an alternative manifestation. Finally, the self-consciousness of the created being, proceeding from a contingent existence and an externally determined activity, does not depend on the being itself in either its quality, quantity or duration. Thus the finite being, neither existing primarily in itself, nor acting solely by itself, cannot return completely upon itself, but always needs some external complement.

In other words, finite existence never contains within itself its own *raison d'être;* and in order, finally, to justify or explain the fact of this existence, it must be linked to absolute Being, or God. In asserting that He exists, we must necessarily attribute to Him the three constituent modes of complete being. Since real existence, action and enjoyment are in themselves purely positive attributes, they cannot be lacking in absolute Being. If He exists, He exists not merely in the mind, but in reality; if He is a reality, He is no dead or inert reality, but a being manifesting itself by its own activity; if He acts, it is not as a blind force, but as consciously aware of His being and taking pleasure in its manifestation. Deprived of these attributes, He would not be God, but a lower nature, less than man. But for the very reason that God is God, that is to say, absolute and supreme Being, the three constituent modes of complete being can only be attributed to Him in their essential and positive character, apart from any idea that is not bound up with the notion of Being itself, but relates only to the mode of contingent being. Thus, the real existence which belongs to God cannot accrue to Him from any external cause, but is a primary and irreducible fact. God exists in Himself and by Himself. The reality He possesses is, in the first place, altogether from within; it is an absolute substance. So, too, the proper action or essential manifestation of God cannot be either determined or modified by any external cause, but is simply the pure and perfect (that is, completely adequate) reproduction of His own being, His unique substance. This reproduction cannot be either a new creation or a division of the divine substance; it cannot be created, because it exists from all eternity; it cannot be divided, because it is not a material thing, but pure actuality. God, possessing it in Himself, manifests it for Himself, and reproduces Himself in a purely interior act. By this act He arrives at the enjoyment of Himself, that is, of His absolute substance, not only as existing, but also as manifested. Thus, the complete existence of God does not require Him to go outside Himself, nor does it set Him in any external relationship; it is perfect in itself, and does not involve the existence of anything outside itself.

In the three constituent modes of His being, God is in unique relation to His own substance: (1) He possesses it in Himself in His "first act" (absolute fact). (2) He possesses it for Himself, in manifesting or producing it from Himself in His

"second act" (absolute action). (3) He possesses it in returning upon Himself, in rediscovering in it, in a "third act," the perfect unity of His being and His manifestation (absolute enjoyment). He cannot enjoy it without having manifested it, and He cannot manifest it without having it in Himself. Thus, these three acts, states or relationships — here the terms coincide — indissolubly bound together, are different but equal expressions of the entire Godhead. In manifesting His intimate nature or in reproducing Himself by Himself, God has no intermediary and submits to no external action which might modify His reproduction or render it incomplete; that which is produced is therefore completely equal to that which produces, in every respect, except in so far as one produces and the other is produced. And as the whole Godhead is contained in its reproduction, so is it wholly contained in the enjoyment proceeding from that reproduction. This enjoyment, being contingent upon no external condition, cannot be an accidental state inadequate to the absolute being of God; it is the direct and complete outcome of the divine existence and action. God, as enjoying, proceeds from Himself as producing and produced. And as the third term, that which proceeds, is determined only by the two first, which are entirely equal to one another, it must also be equal to them in every respect except in so far as it proceeds from them and not *vice versa*.

These three acts are not separate parts of the divine substance; no more can they be successive phases of the divine existence. If the idea of a "part" implies space, that of a "phase" implies time. In excluding these two forms of created existence, we must affirm that the absolute substance is contained in the three modes of divine existence, not only without division, but without succession. This implies three relative subjects or hypostases in the absolute unity of the divine substance. Indeed, if the three modes of absolute existence could be successive, then a single subject would suffice, a single hypostasis might be found successively in three different relationships to its substance. But absolute Being, being unable to change in time, is not susceptible of a successive evolution; the three constituent modes of its complete existence must be in it simultaneous or co-eternal. On the other hand, it is clear that one and the same subject or hypostasis cannot affirm itself simultaneously as not manifested, as manifested, and as proceeding by its manifestation. It is, therefore, necessary to admit that each of the modes of divine existence is always represented by a relatively distinct subject; that it is eternally hypostatized and that consequently there are in God three co-eternal hypostases. This necessity can be presented from another point of view. Since God in the first mode of His existence, as neither produced nor manifested but reproducing and manifesting Himself, is necessarily a genuine subject or hypostasis, and since the second mode of divine existence, God as reproduced or manifested, is completely equal to the first in every respect except the specific difference in their mutual

relationship, it follows that if the first is an hypostasis, the second must also be an hypostasis. For the only relative difference that distinguishes them does not refer to the notion of an hypostasis, but to that of producing or being produced. Thus, if the one is an hypostasis that produces, the other is an hypostasis that is produced. The same reasoning applies completely to the third mode of Divine existence, which proceeds from the two former, inasmuch as God through the accomplishment of His manifestation returns upon Himself in the absolute enjoyment of His manifested being. In removing from this last relationship all notion of time or of a successive process, we are led inevitably to admit a third hypostasis, co-eternal with the other two and proceeding from both as their unity and final synthesis, thus closing the circle of the Divine life. Enjoyment in God (God as enjoying) cannot be unequal to His action or His primordial reality; if, then, the latter are distinct hypostases, the former must be also.

The trinity of hypostases or subjects in the unity of absolute substance is a truth given us by Divine Revelation and the infallible teaching of the Church. We have seen that this truth imposes itself upon the reason and can be logically deduced from the admission that God *is,* in the positive and complete sense of this term. Divine Revelation has not only taught us that there are three hypostases in God, but it has also designated them by specific names. We shall complete the foregoing argument by showing that these names are not arbitrary, but that they correspond perfectly to the trinitary idea itself.

II

The three Divine Hypostases and the proper signification of their names.

GOD possesses positive and complete existence. He is the living God. Life means reproduction. Reproduction or generation is supreme causality, the proper action of a complete and living being. In this perfect causality, the productive cause must, in the first place, contain in itself its product or effect, for otherwise it could only be an occasional cause, and not the true cause of the product. This first phase of absolute life, in which the living effect seems absorbed in the unity of the primordial cause, is only a necessary supposition of the second, that of actual production, in which that which produces distinguishes itself in act *(actu)* from its product, and effectively engenders the latter. But we have already established the fact that since absolute Being can of necessity have no other secondary cause associated with it and limiting its productive action, its immediate product must be strictly adequate to it. Thus, the eternal process of the divine life cannot stop at the second term, the differentiation or reduplication of absolute Being as producer and produced. Their equality and their substantial identity mean that the manifestation of their actual and relative difference (in the act of generation) must inevitably issue in a new manifestation of their unity. And this unity is no mere repetition of that primordial unity in which the absolute cause includes and absorbs its effect in itself. Since the latter, as actually manifested, appears as the equal of that which produced it, they must of necessity enter into a reciprocal relationship. As this reciprocity is not to be found in the act of generation (in which the generator is not in turn generated, and *vice versa)* it necessarily demands a new act determined at one and the same time by the first cause and by its consubstantial product. And since it concerns a relationship which is essential to the Divine Being, this new act cannot be an accident or a transient state, but is eternally substantive or hypostatic in a third subject proceeding from the two first and representing their actual, living unity in the same absolute substance.

After this explanation, it will be easily seen that the names, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, given to the three hypostases of absolute Being, far from being metaphorical, find in the Divine Trinity their proper and complete application,

whereas in the natural order these terms can only be used in an imperfect and approximate sense. And first, as regards the two former terms, when we speak of "father" and "son" we mean to convey no other idea but that of an absolutely intimate relationship between two hypostases of one and the same nature, which are essentially equal to one another, but of which the former gives, without receiving, existence, while the latter receives, without giving, it. The father, *qua* father, is distinct from the son only by having produced him, while the son, *qua* son, is distinct from the father only by being produced by him.

This is all that is contained in the idea of paternity as such. But it is clear that this determinate idea, so clear and distinct, cannot be applied in its purity and entirety to any class of created beings that we know: not in its entirety, for in the natural order the father is only a partial cause of the existence of the son, and the son derives his existence only partly from the father; not in its purity, because besides the specific distinction of having given and received existence, there are between fathers and sons in the natural order countless individual differences, quite foreign to the mere idea of paternity and filiation. To discover the true application of this idea we must rise to the level of absolute Being. There we have seen the relation of paternity and filiation in its purity, for the Father is the sole and unique cause of the Son; in its entirety, for the Father gives all existence to the Son, and the Son has in Himself nothing but what He receives from the Father. There is between them an absolute distinction as regards the act of existence, and an absolute unity in all the rest. Being two, they can unite in an actual relationship and in common produce a new manifestation of absolute substance; but since this substance belongs to them in common and without division, the product of their reciprocal action can only be the explicit affirmation of their unity emerging from and overcoming their actual difference. And as this synthetic unity of the Father and the Son, manifested as such, cannot be represented either by the Father as such or by the Son as such, it must necessarily be substantiated in a third hypostasis to which the name of "Spirit" is entirely applicable from two points of view. First, it is in this third hypostasis that the Divine Being, by its inner reduplication in the act of generation, achieves the manifestation of its absolute unity, returns upon itself, affirms itself as really infinite, possesses itself and enjoys itself in the fullness of its consciousness. Now, this is the specific characteristic of the spirit (in its interior, metaphysical and psychological sense) in so far as it is distinguished from the soul, the intelligence, and so forth. Again, since the Godhead attains its interior completion in its third hypostasis, it is particularly in the latter that God possesses the liberty to act outside Himself and to set in motion an external medium. But it is precisely this perfect liberty of action or movement that characterizes the spirit in the external or physical sense of the word, πνευμα*, spiritus,* that is to say, breath or respiration. Since neither this perfect self-possession nor this absolute liberty of

external action can be found in any created being, it may reasonably be asserted that no being of the natural order is spirit in the full sense of the word, and that the only spirit properly so-called is that of God, the Holy Spirit.

While it is essential to admit three hypostatized modes in the inner development of the Divine life, it is impossible to admit more. In taking as our starting-point the fullness of existence which necessarily belongs to God, we are obliged to add that it is not enough for God to exist simply in Himself, but that He must manifest this existence for Himself, and that even that is not enough unless He can enjoy His existence, thus manifested, in affirming the dominance of His absolute identity and unchangeable unity over the very act of His inner reduplication. But granted this last affirmation, this perfect enjoyment of His absolute being, the immanent development of the Divine life is completed. To possess His existence as pure act in Himself, to manifest it for Himself in absolute actuality, and to have the perfect enjoyment of it — this is all that God can do, without going outside His inner being; if He does anything else, it is no longer in the sphere of his immanent life, but outside it, in a subject which is not God.

Before passing to this new subject, let us note that the trinitarian development of the Divine life, eternally substantiated in the three hypostases, far from modifying the unity of absolute Being, or the supreme *Monarchia,* is simply its full expression, and that for two essential reasons. The divine *Monarchia* is expressed in the first place by the indivisible unity and indissoluble bond between the three hypostases which have no existence at all in a separate state. It is not only that the Father never *is* without the Son and the Spirit, just as the Son never *is* without the Father and the Spirit, nor the Last without the Two Former, but it must also be admitted that the Father is not the Father or first principle, except in so far as He begets the Son and is with Him the cause of the procession of the Holy Spirit. The Father is only a distinct hypostasis, and that the first, with and for the whole Trinity. He could not be the absolute cause if He did not have in the Son His absolute effect, and find in the Spirit the reciprocal and synthetic unity of cause and effect.

It is the same, *mutatis mutandis,* with the two other hypostases. On the other hand, in spite of this mutual dependence, or rather by reason of it, each of the three hypostases possesses the absolute fullness of the divine being. The Father is never limited to existence in Himself or to absolute and primordial reality *(actus purus);* He translates this reality into action, He acts and He enjoys, but He never does so alone — He acts always through the Son, and He enjoys always with the Son in the Spirit. The Son on His part is not only absolute action or manifestation; He also has being in Himself and enjoyment of this being, but He has them only in His perfect unity with the two other hypostases: He has both the self-subsistence of the Father, and the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, the Latter, as the absolute

unity of the Two Former, is necessarily what They are, and possesses in act *(actu)* all that They have, but with Them and through Them.

Thus, each of the three hypostases has absolute being, and has it completely: in reality, in action and in enjoyment. Each is therefore true God. But as this absolute fullness of the divine being belongs to each only in union with the other two and in virtue of the indissoluble bond which unites them, it follows that there are not three Gods. For the hypostases must be isolated in order to be counted; but none of them, isolated from the others, can be true God, since it cannot even *be* in such a condition. It is permissible to represent the Holy Trinity as three separate Beings since no other representation is possible. But the impotence of the imagination is no argument against the truth of the rational idea, which is clearly and distinctly recognized by pure thought. In truth, there is only one indivisible God, realizing Himself eternally in the three hypostatic phases of absolute existence; and each one of these phases, constantly finding itself internally completed by the two others, contains and represents the entire Godhead, is true God through unity and in unity, not through exclusion or in separation.

This effectual unity of the three hypostases derives from the unity of their principle; and this is the second reason for the divine *Monarchia,* or rather a second aspect of it. There is in the Trinity only one first cause, the Father, and thence arises a determinate order which makes the Son ontologically dependent upon the Father, and the Holy Spirit upon the Father and the Son. This order is based upon the trinitary relationship itself. For it is clear that action implies reality, and enjoyment implies both.

III

The Divine Essence and its threefold manifestation

GOD is. This axiom of faith is confirmed by philosophic reason which, in accordance with its own nature, seeks such a necessary and absolute being as should contain in itself its own *raison d'être,* explain itself by itself and suffice to explain all the rest. Starting from this fundamental idea, we have distinguished in God the threefold subject which is implied by complete existence, and the objective essence or absolute substance possessed by this subject under three different relationships, in pure or primordial act, in secondary or manifested action, and in a third act of perfect self-enjoyment. We have shown that these three relationships cannot be founded on any division of parts or succession of phases (two conditions equally incompatible with the idea of Godhead), and that therefore they imply in the unity of the absolute essence the eternal existence of three relative subjects or hypostases, consubstantial and indivisible, to which the sacred names of the Christian revelation — Father, Son and Spirit —are eminently appropriate. It now remains to define and name the absolute objectivity itself, the unique substance of the divine Trinity.

It is one; but since it cannot be one thing among many, a particular object, it is universal substance or "all in unity." Possessing it, God possesses all in it; it is the fullness or absolute totality of being, antecedent and superior to all partial existence.

This universal substance, or absolute unity of the whole, is the essential Wisdom of God (Khocmah, Σοφία). Possessing in itself the latent potentiality of all things, it is itself possessed by God and under a threefold mode. It says itself: *Jahveh qanani reshith darco, qedem miphealav, meaz — Dominus possedit me capitulum viæ suæ, oriens operationum suarum, ab exordio.* And again: *Meholam nissacti, merosh, miqadme arets — Ab æterno ordinata sum, a capite, ab anterioribus terræ.*[1] And in order to complete and explain this threefold manner of being, it adds further: *Vaëhieh etslo, amon, vaëhieh shaashouim yom yom — et eram apud eum (scilicet Dominum — Jahveh) cuncta componens, et delectabar per singulos dies.*[2] *Ab æterno eram apud eum* — He possesses me in His eternal being; *a capite*

[1] 1 Prov. viii. 22-23.
[2] *ibid.,* viii. 30.

cuncta componens — in absolute action; *antequam terra fieret delectabar* — in pure and perfect enjoyment. In other words, God possesses His unique and universal substance or His essential wisdom as eternal Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Having thus one and the same objective substance, these three divine subjects are consubstantial.

Wisdom has told us in what her action consists — it consists in "composing the whole" *(eram cuncta componens).* She goes on to tell us in what her enjoyment consists: *mesakheqeth lephanav becol heth; mesakheqeth bethebel artso, veshahashouhaï eth-bene Adam — ludens coram eo omni tempore; ludens in universo terræ eius, et deliciæ meæ cum filiis hominis*[1] — "*rejoicing* always before Him, rejoicing in the terrestrial world, and my delights with the sons of Man." What then is this rejoicing of the divine Wisdom and why does she find her supreme delight in the sons of Man?

God possesses the totality of being in His absolute substance. He is one in the whole, and He has the whole within His unity. This totality implies plurality, but a plurality reduced to unity, actually unified. And in God Who is eternal, this unification is also eternal; in Him indeterminate multiplicity has never existed as such, has never been produced in act *(actu)*, but is found from all eternity subjected and reduced to absolute unity under its three indivisible modes: unity of simple being, or unity in itself, in the Father; unity of being, actively manifested in the Son, Who is the direct action, the image and Word of the Father; and lastly, unity of being, penetrated by a complete enjoyment of itself in the Holy Spirit, Who is the common heart of the Father and the Son.

But if the eternally actual state of absolute substance (in God) is to be all in unity, its potential state (outside God) is to be all in division. This is indeterminate and anarchic plurality, the Chaos or το απειρον of the Greeks, the German *schlechte Unendlichkeit,* the *tohu va bohu* of the Bible. This antithesis of the Divine Being is from all eternity suppressed and reduced to that state of pure potentiality by the very fact and the first act of the divine existence. Absolute and universal substance belongs in fact to God, He is eternally and primordially all in unity; He *is,* and that is enough for Chaos not to exist. But that is not enough for God Himself Who is not merely Being, but perfect Being. It is not enough to affirm that God *is;* it must also be possible to say why He is. To subsist from the beginning, to suppress Chaos and to contain all in unity by the act of His omnipotence — that is the divine fact that demands explanation. God cannot rest content with being *in fact* stronger than Chaos, He must be so *by right.* And to have the right to conquer Chaos and reduce it eternally to nothingness, God must be more true than it. He displays His truth by confronting Chaos not merely with

[1] *ibid.,* viii. 30, 31.

the act of His omnipotence, but with a reason or an idea. He must, therefore, distinguish His perfect totality from the chaotic plurality, and to each possible manifestation of the latter He must reply, in His Word, by an ideal manifestation of true unity, by a reason showing the intellectual or logical impotence of the Chaos that would assert itself. Containing all within the unity of absolute Omnipotence, God can also contain all within the unity of the universal idea. The God of might must also be the God of truth, the supreme Reason. To the pretensions of the infinitely manifold Chaos, He must oppose not only His being pure and simple, but also a whole system of eternal ideas, reasons or truths, each one of which, linked with all the others by an indissoluble bond of logic, represents the triumph of determinate unity over anarchic plurality, over the Evil Infinity. The chaotic tendency of every particular being to assert itself exclusively as though it were the whole is condemned as false and unjust by the system of eternal ideas which assigns to each a definite place in the absolute totality, thus displaying, alongside the truth of God, His justice and His equity.

But the triumph of reason and truth is still not enough for the divine perfection. Since the Evil Infinity or Chaos is an essentially irrational principle, the logical and ideal manifestation of its falsity is not the proper means to reduce it inwardly. Truth is manifested, light is shed, but the darkness remains what it was: *et lux in tenebris lucet, et tenebræ eam non comprehenderunt.* Truth is a reduplication and a separation, it is a relative unity, for it affirms the existence of its contrary as such, in the act of distinguishing itself from it. And God must be absolute unity. He must be able to embrace in His unity the opposite principle itself, in showing Himself superior to it not only by truth and justice, but also by goodness. The absolute excellence of God must be manifested not only in opposition to Chaos, but also for Chaos, in giving it more than it deserves, in making it share in the fullness of absolute existence, in proving to it not merely by objective reason but by an inner living experience the superiority of the divine plenitude over the empty plurality of the Evil Infinity. The Godhead must be able to meet every manifestation of rebellious Chaos not only with an act of force suppressing the contrary act, not only with a reason or an idea convicting it of falsity and excluding it from true being, but also with a grace penetrating and transforming it and so drawing it back to unity. This threefold unification of the whole, this threefold victorious reaction of the divine principle against potential Chaos, is the inner eternal manifestation of the absolute substance of God or of the essential Wisdom which, as we have seen, is “all in unity.” Strength, truth and grace; or power, justice and goodness; or again, reality, idea and life — all these relative expressions of absolute totality are objective definitions of the divine substance corresponding to the Trinity of hypostases which possess it eternally. And the indissoluble bond between the three Persons of the supreme Being is necessarily manifested in the objectivity of their

unique substance, of which the three principal attributes or qualities are mutually bound up with one another and are equally inseparable from the Godhead. God could not penetrate the Chaos by His goodness, if He did not distinguish Himself from it by truth and justice, and He could not distinguish Himself from it or exclude it from Himself if He did not contain it in His power.

IV

The Soul of the World; the Principle of Creation, Space, Time and Mechanical Causality

WE can now understand the significance of the joy of the eternal Wisdom of which she tells us in Holy Scripture. She “rejoices” in summoning up before God the countless possibilities of all existences outside the Godhead and in reabsorbing them in her omnipotence, her absolute truth and her infinite goodness. In this joy of His essential Wisdom, God, one and threefold, in suppressing the power of the possible chaos, illuminating its darkness and penetrating its depths, is interiorly aware of Himself and proves to Himself from all eternity that He is more powerful, truer and better than any possible being outside Himself. This rejoicing of His Wisdom shows Him that all that is positive belongs to Him in fact and by right, that He possesses eternally in Himself an infinite treasure of all real powers, all true ideas, all gifts and all graces.

In the two first essential qualities of Godhead, God might limit Himself to His immanent manifestation,[1] the eternal rejoicing of His Wisdom; as One almighty, just and true, He might well rest content with triumphing in Himself over anarchic existence in the inner certainty of His absolute superiority. But that does not satisfy grace and goodness. In this third quality, divine Wisdom cannot rest content with a purely ideal object, she cannot stop short at a realization that is only potential, a mere enjoyment. If, in His power and truth, God is all, He desires in His love that all should be God. He desires that there should be outside Himself another nature which may progressively become what He is from all eternity — the absolute whole. In order to arrive itself at the divine totality and to enter with God into a free, reciprocal relationship, this nature must be separated from God and at the same time united to Him; separated by its actual basis which is the Earth, and united by its ideal culmination which is Man. It is supremely in her vision of the Earth and of Man that the eternal Wisdom unfolds her rejoicing before the God of the Future: *mesakheqeth bethebel artso, veshahashouhaï eth-bene Adam.*

We know that the possibility of chaotic existence, eternally contained in God, is eternally suppressed by His power, condemned by His truth and absorbed by His grace. But God loves Chaos in its nothingness and wills that it should exist, for He

[1] Immanent in relation to God, transcendent in relation to us.

is able to draw rebellious existence back to unity and fill the infinite void with His superabundant life. God, then, gives Chaos its freedom; He refrains from acting against it by His omnipotence in the first act of the Divine Being, in the element of the Father, and thus causes the universe to emerge out of its nothingness.

Unless we would repudiate the very notion of Godhead, we cannot admit outside of God any existence in itself, real and positive. What is outside Godhead can therefore only be the Divine transposed or reversed. And this is what we primarily see in the specific forms of finite existence which separate our world from God. This world is, in fact, constituted outside God by the forms of Extension, Time and Mechanical Causality. But these three conditions have nothing real and positive about them; they are simply a negation and transposition of divine existence in its principal categories.

We have distinguished in God (1) His absolute objectivity, represented by His substance or essence, which is the whole in one indivisible unity; (2) His absolute subjectivity or His interior existence, represented in its totality by three inseparable hypostases, mutually conditioning and completing one another; (3) lastly, His free relativity or relationship with what is not Himself, represented first by the joy of the Divine Wisdom, and then by Creation (and, as we shall subsequently see, by the Incarnation). The general characteristic of the Divine Being in these three categories or aspects is its autonomy, its perfect aseity, the absence of any external determining factor. God is (1) autonomous in His objective substance, for, being all in itself, it cannot be determined by anything; (2) He is autonomous in His subjective existence, for it is absolutely complete in its three co-eternal and hypostatic phases, which possess in their unity the totality of being; finally (3) He is autonomous in His relationship to what is not Himself, for this other is only determined to exist by a free act of the Divine Will. Thus, the three categories indicated are merely different forms and expressions of the divine autonomy. And it is on that account that in the terrestrial world, which is simply the reverse image of Godhead, we find the three corresponding forms of its heteronomy: Extension, Time and Mechanical Causality. (1) If the objective and substantial expression of the divine autonomy is “all in unity,” *omnia simul in uno,* the heteronomous objectivity of Extension consists, on the contrary, in the fact that every part of the world outside the Godhead is separate from all the others; it is the subsistence of each one outside the whole, and of the whole outside each one — it is the opposite of totality. Thus, our world, in so far as it is composed of extended parts, represents the divine objectivity reversed. (2) So, too, if the subjective autonomy of the divine existence finds its expression in the equal actuality and the close and indissoluble bond between the three terms of this existence which complete, without succeeding, one another, the heteronomous form of Time presents us, on the contrary, with an indeterminate series of moments challenging one another’s

existence. Each of these moments, in order to enjoy actuality, must exclude all the others, and all of them, instead of completing one another, suppress and supplant one another without ever attaining the totality of existence. (3) Finally, as the creative liberty of God is the final expression of His autonomy, so the heteronomy of the world outside God is completely manifested in Mechanical Causality, in virtue of which the outward action of a given being is never the direct effect of its inward act, but must be determined by a chain of material causes or conditions independent of the agent itself.

The abstract principle of Extension is that two objects, parts of the whole, cannot occupy the same place at the same time, and similarly a single object, a single part of the whole, cannot be in two different places at once; this is the law of division or of objective exclusion between parts of the whole. The abstract principle of Time is that two interior states of a subject (states of consciousness, according to modern terminology) cannot coincide in a single actual moment, and similarly a single state of consciousness cannot be maintained as actually identical in two different moments of existence; this is the law of the perpetual disjunction of the interior states of every subject. Finally, according to the abstract principle of Mechanical Causality, no act or phenomenon is produced spontaneously or of itself, but is entirely determined by another act or phenomenon, which is itself simply the effect of a third, and so on; this is the law of the purely external and occasional relationship between phenomena. It is easy to see that these three principles or laws express but one general urge, tending to disintegrate and dissolve the body of the universe and to deprive it of all inner coherence and of all solidarity between its various parts. This urge or tendency is the very basis of Chaos, that is, of Nature outside the Godhead. An urge implies a will, and a will implies a psychical subject, that is to say, a soul. Since the world which this soul strives to produce — the whole disintegrated, disjointed, and only held together by a purely external bond — is the opposite or reverse of the divine totality, the soul of the world itself is the opposite or antitype of the essential Wisdom of God. This world-soul is a creature, the first of all creatures, the *materia prima,* the true substratum of our created world. In fact, since nothing can have any real and objective existence outside God, the world outside the Godhead can only be, as we have said, the divine world subjectively transposed and reversed: it is simply a false aspect or illusory representation of the divine totality. But even this illusory existence implies a subject putting itself in a false relationship and producing in itself the distorted image of truth. Since this subject can be neither God nor His essential Wisdom, a distinct subject or world-soul must be admitted as the principle of Creation, properly so-called. As a creature, it does not exist eternally in itself, but it exists from all eternity in God, in the state of pure potentiality, as the latent basis of the eternal Wisdom. This potential future Mother of the world

outside the Godhead corresponds, in its complete ideality, to the eternally actual Father in the Godhead.

As pure indeterminate potentiality, the world-soul has a twofold and variable character (ή αόριστος δύας): it can will to exist for itself outside God, it can take the false point of view of chaotic and anarchic existence, but it can also abase itself before God and, by freely attaching itself to the Divine Word, bring all Creation back to perfect unity and identify itself with the eternal Wisdom. But to do this, the world-soul must first enjoy real existence in distinction from God. The eternal Father therefore created it by restraining the act of His omnipotence which suppressed from all eternity the blind desire for anarchic existence. This desire, becoming act, revealed to the world-soul the possibility of the opposite desire, and thus the soul itself received an independent existence, chaotic in its immediate actuality, but capable of changing into the opposite. Having conceived Chaos and given it a reality relative to itself, the soul conceives the desire for deliverance from this discordant existence of aimless and irrational agitation in an abyss of darkness. Drawn hither and thither by blind forces striving with one another for exclusive existence, rent asunder, disintegrated, reduced to a countless multitude of atoms, the world-soul feels a vague but profound desire for unity. By this desire it attracts the action of the Word (the Divine as acting or as manifested) which reveals itself to it at the beginning in the general, indeterminate idea of the universe, the world as one and indivisible. This ideal unity, realizing itself upon the basis of chaotic extension, takes the form of unlimited space or immensity. The whole, reproduced, represented or imagined by the soul in its state of chaotic division, cannot cease to be the whole or lose its unity completely; and since its parts do not wish to complete or penetrate one another in a positive and living totality, they are compelled, while mutually excluding one another, nevertheless to remain together, to co-exist in the formal unity of indefinite space, a form which is entirely external and void of the objective and substantial totality of God. But the soul is not content with external immensity; it wishes also to experience the interior totality of subjective existence. This totality, eternally triumphant in the Divine Trinity, is for the chaotic soul suppressed by that in-determinate series of mutually exclusive and indifferent moments which is called Time. This false infinity which enchains the soul constrains it to desire the truth; and to this desire the Divine Word replies by the suggestion of a new idea. By its action upon the soul, the supreme Trinity is reflected in the stream of indefinite duration under the form of the three times. In seeking to realize total actuality for itself, the soul is compelled to fill up every given moment of its existence by the more or less indistinct memory of a past without beginning and the more or less vague expectation of a future without end.

And, as a deep unchangeable foundation for this changing relationship, there are the three principal states of the soul itself, its three modes of relationship to the Godhead, fixed for it under the form of the three times. The condition of its primordial absorption in the unity of the eternal Father, its eternal subsistence in Him as pure potentiality or mere possibility, is henceforward defined as the Past of the soul; the condition of separation from God by the blind force of chaotic desire makes up its Present; and the return to God, the new reunion with Him, becomes the aim of its aspirations and efforts, its ideal Future.

As upon the anarchic division of extended parts the Divine Word establishes for the soul the formal unity of space, and as upon the basis of the chaotic succession of moments it produces the ideal trinity of time, so upon the basis of mechanical causality it manifests the concrete solidarity of the Whole by the law of universal attraction binding together, by an inner force, all the scattered fragments of chaotic reality to form a single compact and solid body, the primal materialization of the world-soul, the original base of operation for the essential Wisdom.

Thus, through the blind and chaotic struggle which imposes upon the soul an existence indefinitely divided in its parts, exclusively successive in its moments and mechanically determined in its phenomena; through the contrary desire of the soul itself aspiring to unity and totality; and through the action of the Divine Word in answer to this desire — by the united operation of these three agents, the lower world, that is, the world outside the Godhead, receives its relative reality or, in Biblical phrase, the foundations of the Earth are laid. But in the idea of Creation the Bible, like theosophical reason, makes no distinction between the lower and the upper world, between the Earth and the heavens.

Thus we have seen how the eternal Wisdom called forth the possibilities of irrational and anarchic existence in order to confront them with the corresponding manifestations of absolute power, truth and goodness. These divine reactions, which are nothing but "play" (*jeu* — a game)[1] in the immanent life of God, become real principles of being when the anti-divine potentialities which provoke them cease to be pure potentialities. Thus, to the creation of the lower or chaotic world necessarily corresponds the creation of the upper or celestial world: *Bereshith bara Elohim eth hasham-maïm v'eth ha'arets.*

[1] Prov. viii. 31.

V

The Higher World. The Freedom of Pure Spirits

BERESHITH — εν αρχη or better, εν κεφαλαιω[1] — *in principio, seu potius, in capitulo:* To suppose that the opening words of Genesis are only an intermediate adverbial expression, like our modern phrase, "in the beginning," and so forth, would be entirely to misunderstand not only the genius of the Hebrew language, but also the general spirit of the ancient East. When the Hebrew language uses a substantive, it takes it seriously, that is to say, it has in mind an actual being or object denoted by this substantive. Now, it is undeniable that the Hebrew word *reshith,* here translated αρχη, *principium,* is a genuine substantive of feminine gender. The corresponding masculine is *rosh, caput*, head. The latter term is used by Jewish theology pre-eminently to denote God, the supreme and absolute Head of all that exists. But what, from this point of view, can *reshith* be — the feminine of *rosh?* To answer this question we need not turn to the ingenuities of the Cabbalists. The Bible is there to give us a decisive solution. In chapter 8 of the Proverbs of Solomon already quoted, the eternal Wisdom, *Khocmah,* tells us (*v.* 22): *Jahveh qanani* RESHITH *darco* — Jahveh possessed me as the (feminine) beginning of His way. It is then the eternal Wisdom which is the *reshith,* the feminine principle or head (source) of all being, just as Jahveh Elohim, the triune God, is its *rosh,* its active principle or source. Now, according to Genesis, God created the heavens and the Earth in this *reshith,* in His essential Wisdom; which means that this divine Wisdom does not only represent the essential and actual uni-totality of the absolute being or substance of God, but also contains in itself the unifying principle of the divided and disintegrated being of the world. Being the accomplished unity of the whole in God, it becomes also the unity of God and of existence outside the Godhead. It is thus the true rationale and end of Creation — the principle in which God created the heavens and the Earth. While it exists substantially and from all eternity in God, it realizes itself effectively in the world and is successively incarnate therein, in drawing it back to an ever more perfect unity. At the beginning it is *reshith,* the pregnant notion of absolute unity, the unique principle which must unify all; at the end it is *malkhouth*

[1] According to the *Hexapla* of Origen, the word *bereshith* was thus translated by Aquila, the celebrated doctor to whom the Talmud applies the words of the psalm: "Thou art fairer than the children of men."

(βασιλεία*, regnum*), the Kingdom of God, the perfect and completely realized unity of the Creator and the creature. It is not the soul of the world; that is only the instrument, the medium and ground of its realization, which it approaches by the action of the Word and gradually raises to an ever more complete and real identification with itself. The soul of the world, considered in itself, is the indeterminate subject of Creation, equally accessible to the evil principle of Chaos and to the Word of God. The *Khocmah,* Σοφία, the Divine Wisdom, is not the soul, but the guardian angel of the world, overshadowing all creatures with its wings as a bird her little ones, in order to raise them gradually to true being. It is the substance of the Holy Spirit Who brooded over the dark waters of the forming world. *Ve rouakh* (feminine) *Elohim merakhepheth al pene hammaïm.* But let us follow the order of the sacred record: *Bereshith bara Elohim eth hashammaïm v'eth ha'arets.* No research is needed to discover the meaning of the last word: *ha'arets,* Earth. The inspired writer goes on at once to explain; *ve-ha'arets haïethah tohu va bohu:* and the Earth was Chaos. But if by the Earth, in the Biblical account of Creation, we are to understand Chaos or the lower universe outside the Godhead in its chaotic condition, it is clear that the expression *hashammaïm,* the heavens, which the sacred text puts in close relation to the Earth as the opposite pole of Creation, indicates the upper universe or the invisible world of the divine reactions, established or realized distinctly as a counterbalance to chaotic existence.

This invisible world is not without reason denoted in Hebrew (as in Old Slavonic) by a word of dual number, rendered as plural in Western languages. This dual answers to the primordial division of the divine world. We know that the efficient cause of Creation (αρχη τες γενέσευς) is the act of will by which God refrains from suppressing by His omnipotence the potential reality of Chaos, or ceases to react against this potentiality by the special power of His first hypostasis, limiting Himself to reaction by the second and third — by justice and goodness, truth and grace. Since the first hypostasis of the Most Holy Trinity, the Eternal Father, refrained from reacting against the possible Chaos in His specific quality, that is, from suppressing it by His omnipotence, and since this was the prime condition or efficient cause of Creation (for which reason God the Father is pre-eminently the Creator of the world), it follows that to constitute the sphere of divine reactions to Chaos, we have only the specific manifestations of the other two hypostases; and this fact imposes a primordial duality on the invisible universe. We have (1) a system of the immediately creative reactions of the Word, which form the ideal or intelligible world properly so-called, the sphere of pure intelligences, objective ideas and divine thoughts hypostatized; and (2) a system of reactions of the Holy Spirit, more concrete, subjective and living, forming the spiritual world, the sphere of pure spirits or angels.

It is in the creative sphere of the Word and the Holy Spirit that the divine substance or essential Wisdom is determined and appears in its proper character as the luminous and heavenly being separated from the darkness of earthly matter. The proper sphere of the Father is absolute light, light in itself having no relation with darkness. The Son or the Word is as light manifested, the white ray which lights up external objects, not by penetration, but by reflection from their surface. Finally, the Holy Spirit is the ray which is refracted by the non-divine medium and breaks up and creates in this medium the heavenly spectrum of the seven primordial spirits like the [seven] colors of the rainbow.

The pure intelligences which form the world of ideas are absolutely contemplative, impassible and changeless beings. Like stars fixed in the firmament of the invisible world, they are above all desire, all will and therefore all freedom. Pure spirits or angels have a subjective existence more complete or more concrete. Beside intellectual contemplation, they know affective and volitional states and have movement and freedom.

But the freedom of pure spirits is quite different from that which we experience. Not being subject to the objective limitations of matter, space and time, nor to all the mechanism of the physical world, the angels of God have the power to determine their destiny by a single interior act of their will. They are free to declare themselves for God or against Him; but as by their nature (inasmuch as they are immediate creatures of God) they possess from the first a superior light and force, they act with a full awareness and complete effectiveness and cannot go back on their actions. By virtue of the very perfection and greatness of their freedom, they can exercise it only once for all in a single decisive act. The inner decision of their will, encountering no external obstacle, produces instantaneously all its consequences and exhausts their freedom of choice. The pure spirit which freely decides for God enters immediately into possession of the divine Wisdom and becomes, as it were, an organic and inseparable member of the Godhead; love towards God and voluntary participation in the divine action are from henceforward its nature. On the other hand, the spirit which decides to the contrary can never revoke its decision; for it made the decision in perfect knowledge of what it was doing, and it can only have what it desired. It desired separation from God because it had conceived an aversion for Him. Since this aversion could have no sort of motive — for in God can be found no shadow of evil whatsoever to justify or explain a feeling of hostility towards Him — this hostility is purely and simply an act of the spiritual will, having its whole reason in itself and subject to no modification; it becomes the very nature or essence of the fallen angel. Being, as it is, absolute master of itself, independent of any external and temporal cause or circumstance, the will against God is necessarily eternal and irrevocable. It is an infinite abyss into which the rebel spirit is immediately hurled and from which it

can spread its rebellion throughout the material chaos, the physical creation, right to the confines of the divine world. It knew well, in deciding against God, that it would not lack a sphere of action; for the Divine Will had already called forth from the void the world-soul, in awakening in it the chaotic desire, the basis and material of all Creation. This world-soul is an indefinite and indeterminate principle (απειρον και αόριστον), and it will always impart this character in a certain degree to all that issues from itself. Thus there will be a vast no-man's-land remaining in suspense between God and His adversary and providing the latter with the means by which to nourish its hatred, practice its rebellion and prolong its struggle. Its existence, therefore, will not be inert and vacuous, it will have an abundant and varied activity, but the general direction and inner quality of all its activity are predetermined by the primordial act of will which separated it from God. To undo this act and to return to God is for it an absolute impossibility. The contrary teaching of Origen, condemned by the Church, shows that that lofty and gifted mind had but a poor conception of the essence of moral evil, a fact which incidentally he proved in another connection by seeking deliverance from evil passions by means of a purely material and external process.

VI

The three main Stages of the Cosmogonic Process

IN the thought of God the heavens and the Earth, the upper and the lower world, were created together in a single principle which is substantial Wisdom — the absolute unity of the Whole. The union of Heaven and Earth, founded in principle *(reshith)* at the beginning of the work of creation, must be realized in fact by the cosmogonic and historical process culminating in the complete manifestation of this unity in the Kingdom of God *(malkhouth).* This union as actually realized implies a preliminary separation, manifesting itself in the chaotic existence of the Earth, an empty and barren existence plunged in darkness *(khosheh)* and the abyss *(tehom).* This abyss had to be filled, this darkness had to be illumined, this barren womb had to be made fertile, and finally by the united action of both worlds a being had to be produced, half of Heaven and half of Earth, capable of embracing in its unity the totality of Creation and of uniting it to God by a free and living bond, by the incarnation in a created form of the divine eternal Wisdom.

The cosmic process is the successive unification of the lower or earthly world, originally created in a chaotic and discordant condition — *tohu va bohu.* In this process, as revealed in the sacred record of Genesis, we see two principles or productive factors, the one absolutely active, God through His Word and Spirit, and the other partly co-operating by its own strength in the divine order and plan and bringing them to realization, and partly providing simply a passive and material element. For instance, it is said of the creation of plants and animals: *vaïomer Elohim: tad' sheh ha'arets deshe heseb maz'riah zerah,* etc., *et dixit Deus: germinet terra herbam viventem et facientem semen,* etc.; and then: *vattotseh ha'arets deshe heseb maz'riah zerah leminehou,* etc. — et PRODUXIT *terra herbam viventem et facientem semen iuxta genus suum.* And further: *vaïomer Elohim: totse ha'arets nephesh haïah leminah,* etc. *dixit quoque Deus:* PRODUCAT TERRA *animam viventem in genere suo.* It is clear, then, that God does not directly create the various manifestations of physical life, but that He simply determines, directs and ordains the productive force of this agent called "Earth," that is, earthly nature, primal matter, the soul of the lower world. This soul is in itself simply an indeterminate and inordinate force, but capable of aspiring to divine unity and

desiring reunion with the heavens. It is upon this desire that the Word and Spirit of God act by suggesting to the inconscient soul ever more perfect forms of union between the heavenly and the earthly and impelling it to realize them in the medium of the lower world. But since the soul of this world is in itself an undefined duality (αόριστος δύας), it is also a prey to the action of the anti-divine principle which, having failed to constrain the higher Wisdom, besets its lower antitype, the world-soul, forcing it to remain in chaos and discord and, instead of realizing the union of heavens and Earth in harmonious and regularly ascending forms, to produce inordinate and fantastic monsters. Thus, the cosmic process is, on the one hand, the peaceful meeting, love and marriage of the two agents, the heavenly and the earthly, while on the other it is a mortal struggle between the Divine Word and the lower principle for the possession of the soul of the world. It follows that the work of creation, being a doubly complicated process, can only advance in a slow and gradual manner.

The Bible has just formally told us that it is not the *direct* work of God; and the sacred record is amply confirmed by the facts. If the creation of our physical world had emanated directly and exclusively from God Himself, it would be an absolutely perfect work, a calm and harmonious production not only as a whole, but in each of its parts. But the reality is far from corresponding to such an idea. It is only from His own point of view which includes all *(kol asher hasah)* in a moment of vision — *sub specie aeternitatis* — that God can pronounce creation perfect — *tob meod, valde bona.* As for the various parts of the work considered in themselves, they deserve from the mouth of God only a relative approval or none at all. In that, as in all the rest, the Bible is in accord with human experience and scientific truth. If we consider the terrestrial world as it is and especially its geological and paleontological history, so well documented in our days, we find depicted there a laborious process determined by heterogeneous principles which do not achieve a firm and harmonious unity except after much time and great effort. Nothing could bear less resemblance to an entirely perfect work issuing directly from a single divine artificer. Our cosmic history is a long and painful parturition. We see in it clear signs of internal struggle, of shocks and violent convulsions, blind gropings, unfinished sketches of unsuccessful creations, monstrous births and abortions. Can all these antediluvian monsters, these paleozoa — the megatherium, the plesiosaurus, the ichthyosaurus, the pterodactyl and so forth — form part of the perfect and direct creation of God? If all these monstrous species were *tob meod (valde bona),* why have they completely disappeared from our Earth to make room for more successful, harmonious and balanced forms of life? Creation is a gradual and laborious process; that is a Biblical and philosophical truth as well as a fact of natural science. The process, implying imperfection as it does, also implies a definite progress consisting in a

more and more profound and complete unification of material elements and anarchic forces, in the transformation of chaos into cosmos, that is to say, into a living body capable of serving for the incarnation of the divine Wisdom. Without going into the details of cosmogony, I will only indicate the three principal concrete stages of this unifying process.

We have already mentioned the first, determined by universal gravitation, which makes the lower world a relatively compact mass and creates the material body of the universe. There is the *mechanical unity* of the whole. The parts of the universe, while remaining external to one another, are nevertheless held together by an indissoluble chain, the force of attraction. In vain they persist in their egotism; it is belied by the insuperable attraction which impels them towards one another, the primordial manifestation of cosmic altruism. The soul of the world achieves its first realization as universal unity and celebrates its betrothal with divine Wisdom. But, roused by the creative Word, it aspires to a more perfect unity; and in this aspiration it frees itself from the ponderable mass and transforms its potentiality into a new subtilized and rarified material called ether. The Word takes possession of this idealized material, as the proper medium of its formative action; projects imponderable fluids into all the parts of the universe; envelops all the members of the cosmic body in a network of ether; manifests the relative differences of these parts and places them in fixed relationships, and thus creates a second cosmic unity more perfect and more ideal, the *dynamic unity* realized by light, electricity and all the other imponderables, which are simply modifications or transformations of one and the same agent. The characteristic of the agent is pure altruism, an unlimited expansion, a continual act of self-giving. However perfect in itself the dynamic unity of the world may be, it merely envelops the material mass in all its parts; it does not take inward possession of them, or penetrate them to the depth of their being and so regenerate them. The soul of the world, the Earth, sees in the luminous ether the ideal image of its heavenly beloved, but does not in reality unite with it. Nevertheless, it aspires always towards this union, and will not confine itself to the contemplation of the heavens and the shining stars, to immersion in the fluid ether; it absorbs the light, transforms it into living fire and as the fruit of this new union produces from its loins every living soul in the two kingdoms of plants and animals. This new unity, the *organic unity,* with inorganic matter and the etheric fluids as its base and medium, is the more perfect in that it forms and governs a more complicated body by a more active and universal soul. In the plants, life is objectively manifested in its organic forms; it is felt by the animals in its movements and subjective effects; and lastly it is comprehended by man in its absolute principle.

The Earth which, originally void, formless and plunged in darkness, was to be gradually enveloped by light, and given form and diversity; which, in the third

epoch of cosmic growth, had only vaguely felt and confusedly expressed, as in a dream, its creative potentiality in the forms of vegetable life, those first combinations of the dust of Earth with the beauty of the heavens; which for the first time in this plant-world emerges from itself to meet the heavenly influences, then separates from itself in the free movement of the four-footed animals and rises above itself in the airy flight of birds; the Earth, after diffusing its living soul in countless species of vegetable and animal life, finally concentrates and returns upon itself and assumes the form which enables it to meet God face to face and to receive directly from Him the breath of spiritual life. Here, Earth knows Heaven and is known of it. Here the two terms of Creation, the Divine and the non-Divine, the higher and the lower, become one in reality, are actually united and enjoy that union. For true self-knowledge is impossible except by a real union, since perfect knowledge must be realized, and real union must be conceived in idea to be perfect. For this reason the supreme union, that of the sexes, is called "knowledge" by the Bible. The eternal Wisdom, which is in principle the unity of all, and entirely the unity of opposites — a free and reciprocal unity — finds at last a subject in which and through which it can realize itself completely. It finds it and rejoices. "My delight," she says — my supreme delight — "is in the sons of Man."

VII

The threefold Incarnation of the Divine Wisdom

ET formavit Futurus Deorum hominem — pulvis (sic) *ex humo — vajitser Jahveh Elohim eth haadam haphar min haadamah:* If the earth in general signifies the soul of the lower world, the dust of the earth indicates the state of abasement or helplessness of this soul when it ceases to assert and exalt itself in the blind desire of an anarchic existence, when repelling all lower suggestions and abandoning in perfect humility all resistance or antagonism to the heavenly Word, it becomes capable of understanding its truth, of uniting itself to its activity and of establishing in itself the Kingdom of God. This state of humiliation, this absolute receptivity of earthly Nature, is objectively marked by the creation of Man *(humus — humilis — homo);* the sensitive and imaginative soul of the physical world becomes the rational soul of humanity. Having attained an interior union with the heavens, contemplating the intelligible light, it can include by consciousness and reason all that exists in an ideal unity. Ideally an universal being in his rational potentiality as the image of God, Man must become effectively like God by the active realization of his unity in the fullness of Creation. Child of the Earth by the lower life which it gives him, he must give it back transformed into light and life-giving spirit. If through him, through his reason, Earth is raised to Heaven, through him also, through his activity, the heavens must descend and fill the Earth; through him all the world outside the Godhead must become a single living body, the complete incarnation of the divine Wisdom.

In man alone the creature is perfectly, that is, freely and reciprocally, united to God, because, thanks to his two-fold nature, man alone can preserve his freedom and remain continually the moral complement of God, while achieving an ever completer union with Him by a continuous series of conscious efforts and deliberate actions. There is a marvellous dialectic in the law of life of the two worlds. The very supernatural perfection of the freedom enjoyed by a pure spirit, the absence of all external limitation, means that this freedom, manifesting itself completely, is exhausted in a single act; and the spiritual being loses its freedom by reason of the very excess of freedom. On the other hand, the hindrances and obstacles presented by the external medium of the natural world to the realization of our interior acts, the limited and conditional character of human freedom, make

man freer than the angels in that he is allowed to retain his freewill and exercise it continually, and to remain, even after the Fall, an active co-operator in the divine work. It is for this reason that eternal Wisdom does not find her delight in the angels, but in the sons of Man.

Man exists primarily for the interior and ideal union of earthly potentiality and divine act, of the Soul and the Word, and secondarily for the free realization of this union in the totality of the world outside the Godhead. There is, therefore, in this composite being a center and a circumference, the human personality and the human world, the individual man and the social or collective man. The human individual, being in himself or subjectively the union of the divine Word and earthly nature, must begin to realize this union objectively or for himself by an external reduplication of himself. In order really to know himself in his unity, man must distinguish himself as knowing or active subject (man in the proper sense) from himself as known or passive object (woman). Thus the contrast and union of the divine Word and earthly nature is reproduced for man himself in the distinction and union between the sexes.

The essence or nature of man is completely represented by individual man (in the two sexes); his social existence can add nothing to it; but it is absolutely necessary for the extension and development of human existence, and for the actual realization of all that is potentially contained in the human individual. It is only through society that man can attain his final end, the universal integration of all existence outside the Godhead. But natural humanity (Man, Woman and Society), as it emerges from the cosmic process, contains within itself only the possibility of such integration. The reason and consciousness of man, the affections and instinct of woman, and finally the law of solidarity or altruism which forms the basis of all society, these are but a foreshadowing of the true divine-human unity, a seed which has yet to sprout, blossom and bear its fruit. The gradual growth of this seed is accomplished in the process of universal history; and the threefold fruit which it bears is: perfect Woman, or nature made divine, perfect Man or the God-Man, and the perfect Society of God with men — the final incarnation of the eternal Wisdom.

The essential unity of the human being in Man, Woman and Society, determines the indivisible unity of the divine incarnation in humanity. Man properly so-called (the masculine individual) contains already in himself *in potentia* the whole essence of man; it is only in order to realize that essence in actuality that he must, first, reduplicate himself or render his material side objective in the personality of Woman, and secondly, multiply himself or render objective the universality of his rational being in a plurality of individual existences, organically bound together and forming a corporate whole — human Society. Woman being only the complement of Man, and Society only his extension or total manifestation, there is

fundamentally only one human being. And its reunion with God, though necessarily threefold, nevertheless constitutes only a single divine-human being, the incarnate Σοφία, whose central and completely personal manifestation is Jesus Christ, whose feminine complement is the Blessed Virgin, and whose universal extension is the Church. The Blessed Virgin is united to God by a purely receptive and passive union; she brought forth the second Adam, as the Earth brought forth the first, by abasing herself in perfect humility; there is therefore here, properly speaking, no reciprocity or co-operation. And as for the Church, she is not united to God directly, but through the incarnation of Christ of which she is the continuation. It is then Christ alone Who is truly the God-Man, the Man Who is directly and reciprocally (that is, actively) united to God.

It was in the contemplation in His eternal thought of the Blessed Virgin, of Christ and of the Church that God gave His absolute approval to the whole Creation when He pronounced it to be *tob meod, valde bona*. There was the proper subject for the great joy which the divine Wisdom experienced at the thought of the sons of Man; she saw there the one pure and immaculate daughter of Adam, she saw there the Son of Man *par excellence*, the Righteous One, and lastly she saw there the multitude of mankind made one under the form of a unique Society founded upon love and truth. She contemplated under this form her future incarnation and, in the children of Adam, her own children; and she rejoiced in seeing that they justified the scheme of Creation which she offered to God: *et justificata est Sapientia a filiis suis* (Matt. xi. 19).

Mankind reunited to God in the Blessed Virgin, in Christ and in the Church is the realization of the essential Wisdom or absolute substance of God, its created form or incarnation. In truth, it is one and the same substantial form (designated by the Bible as *semen mulieris, scilicet Sophiae*) which realizes itself in three successive and permanent manifestations, distinct in existence but indivisible in essence, assuming the name of Mary in its feminine personality, of Jesus in its masculine personality, and reserving its proper name for its complete and universal appearance in the perfect Church of the future, the Spouse and Bride of the divine Word.

This threefold realization in mankind of the essential Wisdom is a religious truth which Orthodox Christendom professes in its doctrine and displays in its worship. If, by the substantial Wisdom of God, we were to understand only the Person of Jesus Christ, how could all the texts of the Wisdom Books which speak of this Wisdom be applied to the Blessed Virgin? Moreover, this application, which has been made from the earliest times in the Offices of the Latin Church as well as of the Greek Church, has in our own days received doctrinal sanction in the Bull of Pius IX on the Immaculate Conception of the Most Holy Virgin. On the other hand, there are texts of Scripture which Orthodox and Catholic doctors apply

sometimes to the Blessed Virgin, sometimes to the Church; for instance, the passage in the Apocalypse concerning the Woman clothed with the sun, crowned with the stars, and with the moon beneath her feet. Finally, there can be no doubt as to the close link and complete analogy between the individual humanity of Christ and His social humanity, between His natural Body and His mystical Body. In the sacrament of Communion the personal Body of the Lord becomes in a mystical but real manner the unifying principle of His collective Body, the community of the faithful. Thus the Church, human Society made divine, possesses fundamentally the same substance as the incarnate Person of Christ or His individual Humanity; and since this latter has no other origin or substance than the human nature of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, it follows that the organism of the divine-human incarnation, having in Jesus Christ a single active and personal center, possesses also in its threefold manifestation one single substantial basis, namely, the corporal nature of the divine Wisdom, as both latent and revealed in the lower world; it is the soul of the world completely converted, purified and identified with Wisdom itself, as matter identifies itself with form in a single concrete and living being. And the perfect realization of this divine-material substance, this *semen mulieris*, is glorified and resurrected Humanity, the Temple, Body and Spouse of God.

The truth of Christianity, under this positive aspect — the complete and concrete incarnation of Godhead — has particularly attracted the religious soul of the Russian people from the earliest times of their conversion to Christianity. In dedicating their most ancient churches to St. Sophia, the substantial Wisdom of God, they have given to this idea a new expression unknown to the Greeks (who identified Σοφία with the Λόγος). While closely linking the Holy Wisdom with the Mother of God and with Jesus Christ, the religious art of our ancestors distinguished it clearly from both and represented it under the form of a distinct divine being. It was for them the heavenly essence clad in the appearance of the lower world, the luminous spirit of regenerate humanity, the Guardian Angel of the Earth, the final appearance of the Godhead for which they waited.

Thus, side by side with the individual human form of the Divine — the Virgin-Mother and the Son of God — the Russian people have known and loved, under the name of St. Sophia, the social incarnation of the Godhead in the Universal Church. It is this idea, revealed to the religious consciousness of our ancestors, this truly national and yet absolutely universal notion, that we must now expound in reasoned terms. It is for us to formulate the living Word which old Russia conceived and which new Russia must declare to the world.

VIII

Messianic Man and the Chaos of Mankind. The primitive elements of Trinitary Society

AS the intermediary between Heaven and Earth, Man was destined to be the universal Messiah who should save the world from chaos by uniting it to God and incarnating the eternal Wisdom in created forms. This mission involved Man in a threefold ministry; he was to be priest of God, king of the lower world, and prophet of their absolute union: priest of God in sacrificing to Him his own arbitrariness, the egoism of humanity; king of the lower world of Nature in subjecting it to divine law; prophet of the union of the two in aspiring to the absolute totality of existence and in realizing it progressively by the continuous co-operation of grace and freedom, in regenerating and reforming Nature outside the Godhead until its universal and perfect integration is achieved (ή αποκατάστασις των παντων). Submission to God, and the domination of Nature for its own salvation: these two phrases sum up the Messianic Law. Man rejected it because he preferred to achieve the goal directly, by himself, in violation of the order laid down by the divine reason. He wished to unite himself arbitrarily to the lower world of Nature, in virtue of his own desire, thinking by this means to possess himself of an unconditional sovereignty, an absolute autonomy equal to that of God. He would not subordinate his kingship to his priesthood; and consequently he became incapable of satisfying his true aspirations and of fulfilling his prophetic mission. His inordinate desire to unite himself to Nature was bound to result in his subjection to it; and as an inevitable consequence he could not escape contracting the distinctive features of the material world apart from the Godhead, and being transformed to its image and likeness. Now, we know that the essential character of Nature outside God is expressed first by indeterminate plurality in space, or the infinite division of parts; secondly, by indeterminate change in time, or the infinite disjunction of moments; and thirdly, as the result of this double division, by the transformation of all causality into mechanism. It is true that this potentiality of infinite disintegration and universal discord, which is the essential characteristic of Chaos, is limited in creation by the action of the unifying Word which on this chaotic foundation constructed the cosmos. But in the lower Nature (before the appearance of Man) the foundation of Chaos is not suppressed; it persists like fire

beneath the ashes, a prevailing tendency ready to awaken at every opportunity. It is in this potential form that fallen Man has contracted the disorder, becoming thereby what is wrongly called natural humanity, but is in fact chaotic humanity. In this human mass we distinguish clearly the three fundamental characteristics of Nature apart from God. The infinite disintegration of material parts in space is translated into human terms by the indeterminate and anarchic plurality of co-existing individuals; to the infinite disjunction of moments in time corresponds, in the life of mankind, the indeterminate succession of generations which vie with one another for actual existence and in turn supplant one another; and finally the material mechanism of the physical world is transferred to mankind under the form of that heteronomy or rule of fate which subjects the will of Man to the force of circumstances and his inner being to the dominating influence of external environment and temporal conditions.

We know, however, that the Fall of Man could only postpone and not annul his vocation. The salutary obstacles of Space, Time and Mechanical Causality, while separating him from his supreme end, at the same time saved him from absolute and final frustration. (1) The indeterminate plurality of individuals — which is, considered in itself, a declension — is the prime condition of human salvation; for although a part of this great number may by fresh crimes aggravate original sin and propagate it more widely, there always remain some righteous ones to mitigate the effects of evil and to prepare the means of future salvation. Thanks to this indeterminate multiplication, Abel is replaced by Seth and Saul makes room for David. (2) The indefinite succession of generations is a second condition of salvation; none disappears without leaving something to facilitate the work of its successors and to elaborate some more perfect historic form which may better satisfy the true aspirations of the human soul. Thus what could not be revealed in Eve or Tamar or Rahab or Ruth or Bathsheba, was one day revealed in Mary. (3) Finally, the heteronomy of our existence is a third condition of salvation, no less indispensable than the former two. For if the will of Man, both good and bad, was immediately efficacious, there would be an end of Mankind and of Creation. The fratricide Cain would in that case be plunged immediately into the depths of Hell before he had built a town and founded ancient civilization; the good Seth would have ascended to Heaven or at least to Paradise with his brother Abel before he had begotten the ancestors of Jesus Christ; and the lower world, the Earth, robbed of its center of unity and action, would have reverted to the sad condition *of tohu va bohu* in which it was before the Creation. And there would have been no one to give joy and delight to the eternal Wisdom.

If, then, our subjection to the conditions of the material world is a consequence of the Fall and a penalty of sin, we see that this penalty is a blessing and this necessary consequence of evil is a necessary means of absolute good.

As the chaotic Earth could not escape the cosmogonic action of the Word, which transformed it into a balanced, enlightened and living world, so the chaos of mankind, created by the Fall of Eden, had to be subjected to the theogonic operation of the same Word, which aims at regenerating it into a spiritual humanity really unified, enlightened by divine truth, and living with an eternal life. The form of the Messianic Man, rejected by the first Adam, was not entirely destroyed in natural humanity, but simply reduced to the state of latent potentiality; thus it remained as a living seed — *semen mulieris (id est Sophiæ)* — realizing itself partially and progressively, and finally incarnate in the second Adam. This theogonic process, the creation of trinitary Man, Messianic Man or God-Man, through Whom the divine Wisdom becomes incarnate throughout the whole universe, presents, in the order of time, three main stages: (1) the series of Messianic anticipations in "natural humanity" or in the human chaos — before Christianity; (2) the appearance of the individual Messiah in the person of Jesus Christ; (3) the Messianic transformation of the whole of mankind, or the development of Christendom.

Before Jesus Christ, mankind, lacking a real center, was simply a potential organism; in fact, there were only separate organs: tribes, states and nations, some of whom aimed at universal domination. This was already an anticipation of future unity. But in each of these disjointed parts of mankind, whether or no it aspired to supplant the whole under the form of a universal monarchy, there had been from the beginning a certain realization in the social sphere of the Messianic or trinitary form tending to represent in more or less restricted limits the totality of human existence.

This trinitary form has a broad foundation in the being of Man. All human existence is made up of three principal terms: the accomplished facts preserved by the tradition of the past, the actions and tasks imposed by the needs of the present, and the aspirations towards a better state determined by a more or less perfect ideal of the future.

There is an obvious analogy, but also an essential difference, between these constituent modes of human existence and the corresponding modes of Divine existence (to say nothing of the hypostatic character of the latter). The broad reason for this difference is that in God, as absolute Being, the first mode determines the second *completely,* and the two together completely determine the third, in which the Divine Being finally possesses itself and completely enjoys itself. Man, on the other hand (to mention here only the third mode of his subjective existence), cannot actually possess the totality of existence, which is for him only a more or less distant future. This future ideally anticipated cannot be the object of a proper enjoyment, but only of an aspiration.

In our material or animal life, this trinitary form already exists, but it is there a natural symbol rather than a reality. The accomplished fact is here represented by the past generation, the fathers or ancestors; the actuality is the present generation, the men of today; finally, the natural aspirations towards the future are incarnate in the children, the future generation. It is clear that the trinitary form has here a purely relative and fundamentally illusory character: natural life strives to give permanence to the relationship, but never succeeds in doing so, and each generation in turn passes through the state of Future, Present and Past, to disappear into nothingness and oblivion. Each generation desires to possess complete actuality, but since each has an equal right to this possession none can obtain it effectively; and after vain attempts to stem the torrent of temporal existence, all are in turn engulfed in it. But this continual succession of generations does not exhaust all human existence; this is only animal humanity. Besides this there is social humanity, which has never been confined to material actuality or content merely to pursue and maintain the actual fact of existence. Human society, even at the lowest stages of its development, has always coupled facts with principles, realities with ideas.

The actuality of the present moment is never for human society a purely mechanical sequence in time, a mere *postea* to its past, or a purely mechanical and temporal antecedent, a mere *antea* to its future. This actuality is always linked to the two other terms by an inner spiritual bond which fixes the past and the future and which, if it does not stem the torrent of material existence, at least confines it to a definite channel and transforms the Evil Infinity of natural time into a system of historical development. In every human society, however barbarous it may be, above and beyond the material interests of the moment, there is a religious tradition and a prophetic ideal. The past, instead of being ruthlessly supplanted in the manner of those savages who kill and eat their aged parents, is preserved with a filial piety as the basis and abiding sanction of the present; and the future, instead of being conceived as a pitiless fate or sacrificed to the flames of egoism like the children that were consumed in the blazing statue of Moloch, is appealed to and invoked as the true end and rationale of the present, its joy and crown. Thus at the head of every human society we see a trinity, more or less differentiated, of governing classes partly linked, but never identified, with the threefold natural relationship of the successive generations. There are in the first place the *priests* or sacrificers, corresponding to the fathers, the older generation; indeed, originally in the life of tribes and scattered clans, priestly functions were performed by the fathers of families and the domestic hearth was the principal altar. Nevertheless even in this primitive state the father stood for more than the particular fact of natural fatherhood; he was linked by his priestly dignity to the absolute fact of the Divine Fatherhood, to that eternal Past which precedes and conditions all

existence. In contrast to the animals, material generation had in the person of human fathers become a social institution and an act of religion. And if the living father was a priest, the mediator between the present and the past, the dead ancestor, re-entering the invisible world, became merged in the absolute past itself, the eternal Godhead, and became an object of worship. Ancestor-worship is in fact a universal element in religion.[1] Thus the ministry of the immediate past, of the living fathers, the priests, linked the present existence of mankind to a vaguer and more remote past, to the mysterious facts preceding our existence and determining it with an absolute necessity. In the second place, we see the class of *warriors* who by their strength and daring guaranteed to society its actual means of existence and met the pressing needs of the given moment. This class was naturally drawn mainly from the sons of families, the present generation. And although the older generation also took part in military enterprises, it was not Priam or Nestor, but rather Hector and Achilles who commanded the warriors, while duly yielding place to the older men whenever it was necessary to obtain the favor of the gods by sacrifices. Thus the relation between these two main classes of Society roughly corresponds to the relation between the two generations, the present and the past, of natural life. But if this analogy were extended, if the future of the social organism were also to find itself solely or mainly represented by the future generation, the children who supplant their forebears, to be themselves supplanted by their offspring, and so on, then the existence of Society would be confused with the Evil Infinity of natural life, there would be no history, no progress, but simply a continuous and fruitless change. This is not so in fact. In every society there has been from the earliest times, besides the priests and the warriors, a class made up of every age, sex and condition, who anticipated the future of man and satisfied the ideal aspirations of the society in which they lived. In the life of nature the third term, instead of being the true unity of the first and second, is fundamentally a mere repetition of them. The future generation represents the future only in an illusory and ephemeral manner, as one member of an indeterminate series is worth no more than another. In the order of natural succession the new generation supervening upon the older is not in itself more advanced or nearer the ideal of perfection. It is on this account that true social progress, independently of the infinite succession of generations, demands that there be real representatives of the future, men who are in fact more advanced in the spiritual life, capable of satisfying the aspirations of their contemporaries and of confronting a given society with its ideal in the degree to which it can grasp it and they themselves can

---

[1] This thesis has been expounded in our own time with a certain degree of exaggeration by M. Fustel de Coulanges in his *Cité antique,* and in a much more exaggerated form by Mr. Herbert Spencer in *Sociology.* It is not difficult to separate the important element of truth in their ideas from the mistaken conclusions which, especially in the English thinker, are the product of a too narrow and limited point of view.

realize it. To these men of the ideal future I give the general name of *prophets.* The word is commonly understood to signify one who foretells the future.

Between the fortune-teller and the true prophet there is much the same difference as there is between the chief of a gang of robbers and the lawful sovereign of a great state, or between the father of a primitive family sacrificing to the shades of his ancestors and the Pope bestowing his blessing *urbi et orbi* and opening Heaven to the souls in Purgatory. But apart from this difference, which concerns the extent of their respective jurisdiction, there is also another distinction to be drawn. The future may be foretold not merely in words but also in action by a partial anticipation of states and relationships which do not form part of the present condition of humanity. This is prophecy in the proper sense, which moreover presents undefined modifications and gradations. The African witch-doctor, for example, has or claims to have the power of bringing rain or fine weather at his good pleasure. This superior power of the human will over the forces and phenomena of material nature is an attribute of humanity in so far as it is perfectly united to the creative and omnipotent Godhead. Such a union, which is, generally speaking, foreign to our present condition, is simply the ideal goal, the remote future, to which we aspire; and the exercise of a power proper to this future state is an anticipation of the future, or a prophetic act. But true prophecy is not that of the sorcerer. He does not possess, and is not even aware of, the religious and moral conditions of supernatural power; if, in fact, he exercises this power, it is only in a purely empirical manner. But even in the case where his magical power is nothing but a fraudulent pretence, it is nonetheless an anticipation, though only in desire and aspiration, of a higher state, an ideal future reserved for Man. And if we turn from the African witch-doctor to a true Christian wonder-worker such as St. Francis of Assisi, we find in his miracles the same power of the human will over the forces of external nature which the magician of a savage tribe possesses or claims to possess. In both cases the power is limited; for the miraculous power of even the greatest saints has never been constant in its duration or universal in its application. But the great difference is that the saint is aware and in possession of that which is for Man the supreme inner condition of supernatural power, namely, moral union with the Godhead. Thus his power, based on his moral superiority, is a faithful and direct, even though feeble and limited, reproduction of the divine Omnipotence which is no blind force, but the logical consequence of the intrinsic and essential perfection of Absolute Being. In so far as the saint shares in this perfection, he shares also in the divine power and affords us an anticipation of our final state, which is not only real but internally true, perfect in itself, though externally incomplete.

Let us now compare, in quite another sphere of prophecy, the great sage of Greece with a Hebrew *nabi.* Plato in his *Republic* gives us the ideal of human

society organized on the principles of justice and reason. It is the anticipation of a future which was partly realized by the society of medieval Europe.[1] Plato was therefore a prophet, but in the sense in which the African witch-doctor is a wonder-worker; he did not possess, and was not even aware of, the true conditions under which his ideal must be realized. He did not understand that for the equitable and rational organization of social life human justice and reason are not sufficient; nor that the ideal of a just and wise society conceived by a philosopher still has to be made fruitful by a corresponding moral action on the part of society itself. Society is, in fact, dominated by evil; if it is to be organized in accordance with the ideal of the good, it must be saved and regenerated. But abstract meditation will not save it. For all its anticipation of social *truth,* the Platonic idealism did not possess the *way* to its realization and could not give *life* to the conception of it. That is the great difference between the philosophic prophecy of the Greeks and the religious prophecy of the Hebrews. The Israelite *nabi* to whom the truth was revealed by a personal relationship to the living God of history anticipated the ideal future not by abstract thought, but with his heart and soul. He cleared the way, he awakened the life. In his prophecies there was, as in Plato, an ideal of a perfect society; but this ideal was never dissociated from the inner condition which determined its realization, the free and active reunion of mankind with God. The true *nebiïm* knew well that this union was only to be accomplished by means of a long and complicated divine-human process, a process of mutual action and concurrence between God and Man; and not only did they know this as a general principle, but they knew and proclaimed at each given moment what mankind in its provisional central organ, the Jewish nation, must do in order to co-operate effectively in furthering the divine-human work. Their action was complete, since on the one hand they pointed to the absolute goal in the distant future, and on the other they indicated the effectual means of leading mankind towards that goal at the present moment. Thus, in uniting all human anticipations of the ideal future under the general name of prophecy, we are not ignoring the vast and essential difference which separates not merely wizards and sorcerers, but also the loftiest intellects of uninspired humanity from the true prophets of the living God.

[1] On the analogy between the Platonic and the Christian Republics, see among others Ranke in his *Universal History.*

IX

The Messianic Preparation among the Hindus, the Greeks and the Hebrews

AT the dawn of history, every father of a house is a priest or sacrificer, each son of the house is a warrior on an equal footing with all his fellows and owing obedience only to temporary chiefs. But as the unit of society is extended and organized, particular priests begin to collect into a single body forming a specifically religious fellowship, a clergy more or less concentrated in the person of a chief priest or pontiff; at the same time the active part of the population tends to establish and organize itself under the orders of a sovereign who is not only the military leader in time of war, but also the head of society in peace time in all the affairs and practical questions raised by a more complex social life. When society is no longer merely a family and its manifold interests are no longer directly harmonized by natural kinship and by the obvious necessity for a rigid solidarity, conflicts and struggles arise and some impartial authority becomes necessary for the establishment of social equilibrium. Thus the main function of the sovereign in peace time is that of judge, as we see in all primitive states. To lead the nation on the field of battle and to decide its disputes in time of peace are the two main needs which the original institution of monarchy had to fulfil.

While the disintegrated and scattered elements of the spiritual and natural body of humanity were thus re-assembling under the action of the historic Word into the partial unities of rudimentary churches and states, the soul of mankind, repeating at a higher level the stages of the cosmogonic process, was developing its efforts to enter into an ever more intimate union with the Spirit of the eternal Wisdom.

In India the soul of mankind, manifesting itself first through the intuitions of the saints and sages of orthodox Brahmanism, then through the teaching of the orthodox sage Kapila, founder of the Sankhia philosophy, and finally through the new religion of Buddha Sakyamuni, recognized and loved the Absolute primarily in its *negative* form as the opposite of existence outside the Godhead, or the nature of the world. For the first time the soul of mankind became profoundly aware of the vanity of material life and conceived an overwhelming disgust for this life of illusion, which is in fact death rather than life, in so far as it devours itself continually and never achieves stability or satisfaction.

But disgust with false life did not reveal the true. The human soul as manifested in India, while asserting with perfect certainty and admirable power that the Absolute is not to be found in material life, that it is not identical with Nature and the world, was unable to discover or to say where it is to be found or what it is. But instead of recognizing this inability and seeking its causes, the wisdom of India asserted its own impotence as the final word of truth and pronounced that the Absolute is to be found in Nothingness, that it is non-existence, Nirvana.

For a moment India, through its sages, had acted as a national organ of the universal soul of mankind, in perceiving the vanity of natural existence and freeing itself from the bonds of blind desire. The thought and feeling that possessed Buddha and his disciples when they affirmed that the Absolute is not anything, that it is none of all the things that exist in Nature, was in fact a universal act of the soul of mankind, which was bound to pass through this negative truth before conceiving the positive idea of the Absolute. But the wisdom, or rather the folly, of the East consists in taking a relative and provisional discovery for complete and final truth. The fault is not that of the human soul, but that of the soul of these sages and of the nations that adopted their teaching. In halting at a necessary but lower stage in the universal process, these nations did not check the progress of history, but remained themselves outside the progressive movement of humanity away from its immersion in a barbarous particularism. The universal soul forsook them and went to seek among other nations the spiritual organs for new modes of union with the Divine essence. Through the inspired sages, poets and artists of Hellas it perceived and loved the Absolute, not as the Nothingness of Buddhism, but as the Idea and the ideal world of Plato, an eternal system of intelligible truths reflected here below in the sensible forms of Beauty.

The idealism of Greece was a great truth, more positive and complete than the nihilism of India. Yet it was not the complete and final truth, so long as the ideal world was considered in its purely theoretic and æsthetic aspect, so long as it was simply contemplated apart from reality and life or realized exclusively in the superficial forms of plastic beauty. If the ideal world is truer than the material world, it cannot be powerless against it. It must penetrate it, subdue it from within and regenerate it. The intelligible light of the higher world must be transfused into the moral and practical life of the lower world; the divine will must be accomplished on Earth as it is in Heaven. The Word of God is not only the sun of truth, of which the reflection is seen in the troubled stream of natural life; it is also the beneficent angel who descends into the stream to purify its waters and to open up beneath the sand and slime of human passions and errors the well of living water springing up into eternity. The wisdom of the Greeks, like that of the Hindus, was content to call a final halt at the stage of truth which it had reached. The last utterance of the Hellenic wisdom, the Neo-Platonic philosophy, insisted even more

than Plato himself on the purely theoretic or contemplative character of the practical life. The true sage, according to Plotinus, must be a stranger to any practical aim, any activity, any social interest. He must flee the world in order first to raise himself by abstract meditation to the intelligible world and then to be absorbed in ecstasy by the nameless abyss of absolute unity. The Proteus of human errors is fundamentally one identical being, and this identity reveals itself especially in the ultimate conclusions of systems which are to all appearance diverse in origin. Thus, the final absorption in the unnamable Absolute of Neo-Platonism is indistinguishable, except in words, from the Buddhist Nirvana.

If the two great Aryan nations confined themselves in the last resort to this negative revelation of the Absolute, the positive revelation created for itself a national organ in the Semitic people of the Hebrews. The religious life and history of mankind were concentrated in this unique people because it alone sought in the Absolute the living God, the God of history; the positive future of humanity was prepared and revealed in this people because it alone saw in God not only Him Who is, but also Him Who will be, Jahveh, the God of the Future. Salvation came of the Jews and could come only of them because they alone understood true salvation — not absorption in Nirvana by moral and physical suicide, not the abstraction of the mind into pure idea by a theoretic contemplation, but the sanctification and regeneration of the whole being and existence of Man by a living activity, both moral and religious, by faith and works, by prayer, labor and charity.

While the Hindus and the Greeks stopped at partial aspects of the Godhead which they were foolish enough to take for the whole, thus transforming truth into error, the Hebrews had received by means of their revealed religion the living germ of the divine Essence in its complete and final truth; not that this Essence was manifested to them in an instant in all its absolute perfection: on the contrary, its manifestations were gradual and very imperfect, but they were real and true. They were no distant reflections or scattered rays of the divine idea illuminating the mind of an isolated sage — they were substantial manifestations of Divine Wisdom itself, produced by the personal action of the Word and the Holy Spirit and addressed to the whole nation as a social entity. The Divine Wisdom did not only enter into the intelligence of the Israelites; it took possession of their hearts and souls, and at the same time appeared to them in sensible forms.

We see, in fact, in the Old Testament a twofold series of divine manifestations: the phenomena of the subjective consciousness by which God speaks to the soul of His righteous ones, the Patriarchs and Prophets, and the objective appearances by which the divine power or glory *(shekhinah)* manifests itself before all the people, concentrated upon material objects such as the Altar of Sacrifice or the Ark of the Covenant. This twofold process of moral regeneration and external theophany was bound to attain its goal; these two theogonic currents inevitably met and coincided

in the creation of an individual being who, absolutely holy and pure in body and soul, could not only morally but also physically incarnate God in himself and could unite in one being Jacob and the Stone of Bethel, Moses and the Ark of the Covenant, Solomon and his Temple.

All peoples, or nearly all, have had in their religions the notion of a divine woman and a divine man, of a Virgin-Mother and a Son of God coming down to Earth to struggle against the forces of evil, to suffer and to conquer. But there can be no question that only in the womb of the Jewish people have these universal ideas taken bodily form and been actually hypostatized in the two historic persons of the Virgin Mary and Jesus Christ. This unique phenomenon implies a unique history, a preparation or special education of this people. Even the rationalists should be forced to this conclusion. And indeed, apart from all miraculous facts in the proper sense of the term, there is in the social and political sphere a general fact which distinguishes the history of the people of Israel and gives it an essential pre-eminence over the two great nations which by their original and creative genius seemed called to play a leading part in the destinies of mankind. Whereas the national development both of the Hindus and of the Greeks followed the path of crisis and revolution and issued in purely negative results, the development of the Hebrew people was on the whole brought about along organic and evolutionary lines and issued in a positive result of immense and universal significance, namely, Christianity. On the one hand, we see only distorted and truncated adumbrations of trinitary Man or of the Messianic form; on the other, we find the three real elements of social Messianism in their normal and harmonious relationship, foreshadowing and preparing the appearance of the true personal Messiah.

In India, the priestly caste of the Brahmins, representative of the religious tradition, of the sacred and inviolable past, aimed at retaining its own exclusive supremacy and exerted in actual life the oppressive power of a ruthless legalism, suppressing all possibility of free spiritual movement or social progress. But when priests aspire to direct government of the world, they inevitably succumb to a fatal dilemma: either they govern in reality, entering into the material details of secular actuality, and thus compromise their religious prestige, lower their sacred dignity and in the end lose their authority in the eyes of the masses and with it all their power; or else, while retaining direct control of society, they desire to remain true priests, and accordingly their government loses its sense of reality and, being unable to meet the lawful needs of those whom they govern, they either ruin society if it remains loyal to them or are deprived and supplemented by the active part of the nation. In India the priestly caste was obliged to surrender a large part of its control to the warrior class, but what it retained was enough to arrest the free development of the national life. This struggle was complicated by the increasing

activity of the third of the social orders,[1] the sages, who were diverging more and more from the orthodox teaching and traditional discipline and finally came into open conflict with the Brahmins. The military or royal class was divided in the struggle, but ultimately sided with the representatives of tradition; and the Hindu prophets, the sages of Buddhism, were cruelly persecuted and eventually expelled from India. If, on the one hand, the negative wisdom of Buddhism, bitterly opposed to the present and to the past, was nothing but an empty and barren utopianism, the priesthood and the monarchy, on the other hand, by uniting against the new movement of thought and stamping it out with violence, robbed India of all freedom and deprived her of all possibility of historic progress. Despite the superiority of the Aryan race and the great qualities of her national genius, India has thenceforth remained an impotent slave, yielding without resistance to every master who has claimed her.

The rise of Indian culture is marked by the predominance of the priestly caste representative of the past and of the common tradition; the beginnings of the history of Greece, on the other hand, are characterized by the dominance of the active part of society, the warriors, the men of self-assertive, self-displaying and adventurous violence. Though the superiority of this element of society was at first eminently favorable to the progress of all human activities, the crystallization of the military class in cities or states did not fail subsequently to become a menace and a hindrance to the free movement of the national spirit, and in fact determined its revolutionary character. A society which is centered in a single purely political body inevitably degenerates into a condition of despotism, whatever its form of government may be. The men of the present, the practical men who govern absolute states, whether republics or monarchies, disbelieve in the past and fear the future. Moreover, though they are themselves devoid of true piety or true faith, they tolerate the representatives of religious tradition as harmless or even useful on condition that they remain inactive; they assign an honorable place to an official priesthood, not only as a means of controlling the blind mob, but also as an ornamental coping-stone to the structure of the omnipotent State. But they have an implacable hatred for any free and spontaneous movement of religion, for anything that opens new horizons to the soul of Man or tends to advance him in any way towards his ideal future. The Athenian government, for all its democratic character, could do nothing but banish Anaxagoras and poison Socrates in the name of the Fatherland, that is, of the absolute State. Under such circumstances, the progressive movement of religious and philosophic thought is inevitably brought to a rupture with the powers of the present and the tradition of the past, with the State and the

[1] It goes without saying that the division into castes in India is a local phenomenon, not to be confused with the three governing classes found in every Society.

State religion. Thought becomes cosmopolitan; while Socrates and Plato despised the Athenian democracy, Aristotle despised all the republican constitutions of the Greek cities and preferred the semi-barbarous monarchy of the Macedonians, until at last the Cynic and Stoic philosophers repudiated all idea of Fatherland or State, and declared themselves indifferent to all public concerns. The independence and political organization of Hellas were destroyed by a philosophy and a philosophical religion which raised nothing upon the ruins of the Fatherland.

This antagonism between the present existence of the nation, as represented by the Greek republics, and the higher thought, the future of the nation, as represented by the idealism of the Greeks, this struggle between Philosophy and the State was fatal to both. The State lost the reason for its existence, and the ideal of the philosophers failed to achieve any concrete or living realization. The State, content to rely solely upon violence, perished by violence; and Philosophy, too contemptuous of reality, remained an abstract and impotent ideal. Justice demanded that it should be so. Any more positive outcome of the national life was not only as impossible for the Greeks as for the Hindus; it would not have been desirable. Since the two highest conceptions which inspired the genius of these two nations — the Indian pessimism with its Nirvana, and the Greek idealism with its absorption in the Absolute — were neither of them the full and final truth, they had neither the power nor the right to achieve a permanent and harmonious realization. A nihilist pessimism creating a social organization, a contemplative idealism capable of modifying things as they are — these are contradictions in terms. And if, despite this intrinsic contradiction, these two imperfect national ideas had been given stability and permanence by an external equilibrium of social forces, mankind would not have profited in the least. There would merely have been three Chinas instead of one.

If the history of the Hebrews bore a different character and produced other fruits, it was because the national life of Israel was based upon a religious principle that was complete in itself and capable of organic development. This principle was manifest in the trinitary form of the Jewish theocracy in which the three social powers, ranging themselves in a normal and harmonious relationship, foreshadowed and prepared the Kingdom of the true Messiah. We are not forgetting the unfaithfulness of the Jewish people and their repeated efforts to shatter the trinitary form of the Mosaic theocracy. We know well that King Saul massacred the priests of Jahveh at Nob, and that succeeding kings, both at Samaria and in Jerusalem, persecuted and put to death the true prophets. But these facts, which are only too certain, must not prevent us from recognizing three undeniable truths of history: (1) that the idea of trinitary theocracy, that is of the organic co-operation and moral harmony between the three powers governing a complete society — that this idea, quite unknown to both Hindus and Greeks, was always

present to the mind of Israel; (2) that this idea, at the most solemn crises of Jewish history, took form and was effectively realized; (3) that the representatives of national progress, the men of the future, the men who made history — in a word, the prophets — never entered upon the path of pure revolution; while they scourged with their inspired words the misdeeds of the priests and princes of the nation, they never repudiated in principle the priesthood of Aaron or the kingship of David.

Moses, the greatest of the prophets, did not assume the priestly power, which he left to Aaron, nor the military leadership, which he bestowed on Joshua. Nor did he claim any exclusive exercise of the prophetic power, which he imparted to the seventy representatives of the people, uttering the prayer that all the Israelites might receive the gift of prophecy. So, too, David, the supreme instance of the theocratic king, was the restorer and champion of the priesthood. He would do nothing without consulting the infallible oracle (the Urim and Thummim) which belonged to the office of the High Priest; and at the same time, though himself a prophet by a personal endowment, he bowed to the moral authority of public prophecy. The history of Old Testament theocracy reaches its culmination — the complete differentiation and perfect harmony of the three powers — when, towards the end of David's reign, his son Solomon is raised to the throne and anointed king by the high priest Zadok and the prophet Nathan. And when, after the failures and downfall of the kings of Judah and their rivals of Ephraim, the cream of the people, punished by the fall of Samaria and Jerusalem and the captivity of Nineveh and Babylon, returned to the Holy Land to re-establish the society of Jahveh under the protection of Persia, we find the prophet Zechariah insisting upon the trinitary formula of the re-established theocracy, upon solidarity and harmony between the priesthood in the person of Joshua, son of Josedek, and the temporal princedom in the person of Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel — between the two powers to which he, the prophet, was the living bond of union and inspired peace-maker.

The children of Israel never forgot that Society is the body of the perfect Man, who is of necessity trinitary: priest of the Most High, king of the Earth and prophet of the union between the human and the Divine. This unique people anticipated and prepared the coming of the God-Man, not only by the insight of its seers, but by the constitution of its society, by the very fact of its trinitary theocracy.

It is well known that the sacred anointing of sovereigns was among the Hebrews the common prerogative of priests, kings and prophets. Thus the supreme Anointed One (the Messiah or Christ) was to unite in Himself the three powers. And in fact He did reveal Himself as the absolutely pure and holy Priest or sacrificer, by offering to the Heavenly Father the complete sacrifice of His manhood; as true King of the world and of material Nature which by His resurrection He rescued

from the law of death and conquered for eternal life; and finally, as perfect Prophet, by showing to men, in His ascension into Heaven, the absolute end of their existence, and by giving them, in the sending of the Holy Spirit and the founding of the Church, the strength and means necessary for the attainment of that end.

X

The absolute sovereignty of Christ. The social trinity.
Priesthood and fatherhood

AS God in His Trinity of Persons possesses absolutely the fullness of His divine substance, His heavenly Body or His essential Wisdom, so too the God-Man in the trinity of His Messianic powers possesses completely the Universal Church, His divine-human Body, at once heavenly and earthly, the perfect Spouse of the incarnate Word. "All power has been given unto Me in Heaven and Earth." This universal power is not the omnipotence of God; that belongs eternally to the Word and so cannot be given to him. The power here referred to is the Messianic power of the God-Man, a power that does not relate to the universe outside God as such, but to the universe reunited to God, co-operating with Him and incarnating in time His eternal essence. If the fullness of this power belongs by right to Christ and only to Him, since He alone could merit it, the exercise of this divine-human power demands the free submission and the living co-operation of mankind itself. The action of Christ is therefore determined here by the progressive development of humanity, drawn by degrees into the divine-human sphere, assimilated to the mystical Body of Christ and transformed into the Universal Church.

If God, that is to say, Christ in glory, had wished to impose His truth and His will upon men in a direct and supranatural manner, if He had wished to save the world by force, He could well have done so; just as before His glorification He could have asked His heavenly Father to send Him a legion of angels to protect Him from the servants of Caiaphas and the soldiers of Pilate. In that case the history of the world would have been soon completed, but it would not have achieved its goal; there would have been no free co-operation between Man and God, no true union and perfect concurrence between the creature and the Creator; and mankind itself in losing its freedom of choice would have been assimilated to the physical world. But the Divine Word did not become incarnate on Earth in order to sanction materialism. Since that incarnation, the freedom of Man remains assured; the Universal Church has a history. It was necessary that Christ should ascend to the heavens and govern the Church by means of human ministers to whom He might delegate the moral and juridical fullness of the three Messianic

powers, without thereby imparting to them the immediate efficacy of His omnipotence which would have restricted the freedom of men. In a word, we know that in founding the Church Christ delegated His powers to her; and in doing so he followed what we may call the trinitary scheme, *ratio Trinitatis.*

The Trinity of God is the evolution of absolute Unity which contains in itself all the fullness of Being, unfolding itself in three hypostatized modes of the divine existence. We know that in the Trinity absolute Unity is secured: (1) by the ontological primacy of the first hypostasis which is the original cause or principle of the two others, but not *vice versa;* (2) by the consubstantiality of all three, ensuring the indivisibility of their being; and (3) by their perfect solidarity which does not permit of their acting separately. The social trinity of the Universal Church is the evolution of the ecclesiastical monarchy which contains in itself all the fullness of the Messianic powers, unfolding itself in the three forms of Christian sovereignty. As in the Godhead, the unity of the Universal Church is secured: (1) by the absolute primacy of the first of these three powers, the pontificate, which is the only sovereignty directly and immediately instituted by God and therefore *de jure* the cause and necessary condition of the two others; (2) by the essential community of these three powers as included within the same Body of Christ and sharing the same substance of religion, the same faith, tradition and sacraments; (3) by the moral solidarity or community of aim which for all three can be nothing but the coming of the Kingdom of God, the perfect manifestation of the Universal Church.

The religious community and moral solidarity of the three sovereign powers under the absolute primacy of the universal pontificate, such is the supreme law, the ultimate ideal of social Christendom. But though in God the trinitary form of unity exists in actuality from all eternity, in the Church it is only gradually realized. Hence, there is not only a difference, but even a certain contrast between the Divine Trinity and the social trinity. The primary datum of the Divine existence is absolute Unity, of which the Trinity is the direct, perfect and therefore eternal unfolding. The primary datum of the Church is, on the contrary, the indeterminate plurality of natural, fallen humanity. In the Divine Being the Trinity is the form by which absolute Unity extends and unfolds itself; in the social being of the human race the trinity is the form by which the indeterminate plurality of particular elements is reduced to a synthetic unity. Thus, the development of the Church is a process of unification within an ideally constant, but actually variable, relationship between *de jure* unity and *de facto* plurality, a process which involves two main operations: the progressive centralization of the given ecclesiastical body, and the unifying and synthetic action of the centralized Church which aims at the incorporation of the whole of mankind into itself. The hypostases of the Divine Trinity are absolutely simple in themselves and their trinitary relationship is

perfectly pure and immediate. The sovereign powers of the trinitary society of the Universal Church are neither simple in themselves nor in the conditions in which they must be realized. They are not simple in themselves, for they are only relative centers of a collective whole. The mode of their realization is complicated not only by the indeterminate plurality of the human medium in which they must manifest themselves, but also owing to the fact that the perfect Messianic revelation finds in natural humanity only partially successful attempts at unification, upon which the unifying work of the Church must be grafted. While this materially assists the divine-human operation, it also imparts to it a less pure, regular and harmonious character. The chaos which is only veiled by the physical creation still asserts its claims not only in the history of natural humanity, but also in the history of Religion and of the Church.

The aim of the divine-human work is to save all men equally, to transform the whole world into a royal and prophetic priesthood, a society of God in which men find themselves in direct relation to Christ and have no need of sun (that is, of a special priesthood), of moon (that is, of a special kingship), or of stars (that is, of prophecy as a public function). But to attain this end, it is not enough to define it. It is only too obvious that the mass of men do not individually and subjectively possess piety, justice and wisdom in sufficient measure to enter into direct contact with the Godhead or to invest each individual with the character of priest, king and prophet. Hence, it is necessary that these three Messianic attributes should be given objective and organic form in public and social life, and should be permanently differentiated in the universal organism in order that Christ may have specific organs of His activity as Priest, King and Prophet. The people of Israel said to Moses at the foot of Sinai: “We cannot endure the presence of Jahveh, we shall all die. Go thou in our stead to speak with Jahveh, and thou shalt bring back all that he shall say to thee for us; so shalt thou be a mediator between us and the Most High, that we may live.” And the Lord said to Moses: “What this people have said, they have well said.” And by the command of Jahveh, Moses not only acted personally as a mediator between the Godhead and the people, but also, in declaring that the people had been called to be a priestly kingdom *(malkhouth cohanim),* he founded, as we have seen, the three powers through which Jahveh was to exercise His social activity in Israel. The human mediator of the Old Testament thus foreshadowed the divine-human Mediator of the New Covenant. Jesus Christ, while preaching the Kingdom of Heaven which is within us, grace and truth, and proclaiming the perfect unity of love and freedom as the supreme law of His Church, none the less proceeds to organize the ecclesiastical body and to bestow upon it a central organ by the method of a special choice. All must be completely equal, all must be one, and yet there are only twelve Apostles to whom the power of Christ is delegated,

and among them there is only one on whom this power is conferred completely and absolutely.

We know that the principle of chaotic existence, of existence, that is to say, apart from the Godhead, is manifested in the life of natural humanity by the indeterminate succession of generations, in which the present hastens to supplant the past, only to be itself continually supplanted by an illusory and transient future. The parricidal children, becoming fathers, cannot but beget a new generation of parricides, and so on to infinity. Such is the evil law of mortal life. Therefore, if mankind is to be regenerated and given true life, its past must above all be stabilized by the organization of a permanent fatherhood. Purely human society already allots to the transitory fatherhood of natural life three distinct functions: the father produces and sustains the *existence* of the child by begetting it and providing for its material needs; he guides the moral and intellectual *development* of the adolescent by educating it; finally, he remains for his grown son the living and venerable *memory* of his past. The first relationship is for the child one of complete *dependence;* the second lays upon the adolescent the duty of *obedience;* the third only demands filial *piety,* a free sentiment of veneration and a mutual friendship. If, in family life, fatherhood is seen under these three successive aspects, in the regenerate social life of the whole human race it assumes them simultaneously. For there are always individuals and nations that have yet to be begotten to spiritual life, and have yet to receive the elements of religious nurture — nations and individuals in moral and intellectual infancy; others, like adolescents, must in every age develop their spiritual powers and faculties with a certain freedom, but none the less must be constantly watched over and guided in the true path by the authority of a father, which shows itself at this stage mainly as an educative and teaching authority. Finally, there are always, if not whole nations, at least individuals who have reached spiritual maturity, and the more conscious and free they are, the greater is the veneration and filial piety they feel for spiritual fatherhood.

From another point of view, there is bound to be an hierarchical gradation in spiritual fatherhood in proportion to the extent of the social units which it embraces. We know that the Church is natural humanity transubstantiated. Now, natural humanity is constituted on the analogy of a living body. A physical body is a complex unity made up of relatively simple units of different degrees in a complicated relationship of subordination and co-ordination. The main degrees of this physical hierarchy are three in number. The lowest degree is represented by the relatively simple units, the elementary organs or organic elements of the body. In the middle degree we find the limbs of the body and its organs properly so-called, which are more or less composite. Finally, all these members and organs are subordinate to the unity of the whole body controlled by a central organ.

Similarly, in the political organism of natural humanity, which was to be regenerated by Christianity, relatively simply units — tribes, clans, rural communities, small states — were united in composite collectivities more or less subdivided, nations at different stages of development, provinces of varying extent; finally all the provinces and nations were united in the universal monarchy, governed by a unique social organ, the city of Rome, a city which concentrated in itself the whole world and was at once *urbs et orbis.*

This was the organism which was to be transubstantiated by Christianity. The body of historic humanity was to be regenerated in every part in accordance with the order of its composition. And since Christ established a spiritual fatherhood as the basis of this regeneration, that fatherhood had to take form in accordance with the given variations in the forms of society. There were, therefore, three degrees in the spiritual fatherhood or the priesthood: each primary social community or village, transubstantiated into a Church, received a spiritual father or priest; and all these priests together formed the lower clergy or the priesthood, properly speaking. The provinces of the Empire, transubstantiated into eparchies or dioceses of different orders, each formed a large family with a common father in the person of the *archiereus* or bishop, the immediate father of the priests under him and through them of all the faithful of his diocese. But all the spiritual social units of this second order represented by the episcopate, the particular Churches of cities, provinces and nations governed by prelates of all degrees (simple bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, primates or patriarchs) are only members of the Universal Church which must itself be manifest as a higher unit embracing all these members. The mere juxtaposition of its parts is not in fact enough to constitute a living body. It must possess a formal unity or substantial form which definitely embraces in actuality all the particular units, the elements and organs of which the body is composed. And if the particular spiritual families which between them make up mankind are in reality to form a single Christian family, a single Universal Church, they must be subject to a common fatherhood embracing all Christian nations. To assert that there exist in reality nothing more than national Churches is to assert that the members of a body exist in and for themselves and that the body itself has no reality. On the contrary, Christ did not found any particular Church. He created them all in the real unity of the Universal Church which He entrusted to Peter as the one supreme representative of the divine Fatherhood towards the whole family of the sons of Man.

It was by no mere chance that Jesus Christ specially ascribed to the first divine hypostasis, the heavenly Father, that divine-human act which made Simon Bar-Jona the first social father of the whole human family and the infallible master of the school of mankind. “It is not flesh and blood which have revealed it to thee, but My Father Who is in heaven.” God the Holy Trinity is as indivisible in His action

ad extra as in His inner life. If St. Peter was divinely inspired, it was by God the Son and God the Holy Ghost as much as by God the Father, and since it was a matter of inspiration it might have seemed more appropriate to make special mention of the Holy Spirit Who spake by the prophets. But it is just here that we see the divine reason which governed every word of Christ, and the universal significance of His utterance to Peter. For it was not a matter of asserting that in this particular instance Simon had been inspired from above; that was as possible for him as for any of his fellows. But it was a matter of establishing in his favor the unique institution of universal fatherhood in the Church, the image and instrument of the divine Fatherhood; and therefore it was above all to the heavenly Father that the supreme reason and sanction for this institution was to be referred.

It is hard to leave the pure air of the Galilean mountains for the polluted atmosphere of the Dead Sea. Our anti-Catholic controversialists, while admitting that the Church of the parish or of the diocese needs its priest or bishop, its visible father, the human organ of the divine Fatherhood, will hear nothing of a common father for the whole Universal Church. The only head of the Church, they say, is Jesus Christ. And yet they see no reason why a parish or a diocese should not be governed by a visible minister; every Orthodox is ready to see in each bishop or priest a vicar of Jesus Christ, though he cries Blasphemy! when Catholics give this title to the first of the patriarchs, the successor of St. Peter. But do these Orthodox schismatics in fact recognize Jesus Christ as Head of the Church? If He were really for them the sovereign Head, they would obey His words. Is it obedience to the Master that drives them into rebellion against the steward that He has Himself appointed? They are ready to allow Christ to act through His ministers in any given part of His visible Kingdom, but they appear to think that He exceeded the limits of His power and abused His rights in giving to Peter the keys of the whole Kingdom. It is as though an English subject, while allowing the Empress of India the right of nominating a governor at Madras and a magistrate at Bombay, were to dispute her appointment of the Viceroy at Calcutta.

But, it may be said, the Universal Church in her entirety goes beyond the bounds of earthly humanity; she includes the saints in Paradise, the souls in Purgatory and even, adds Khomyakov, the souls of those yet unborn. We doubt whether the Pope is much concerned to extend his jurisdiction over the souls of the unborn. But, speaking seriously, we are not dealing with the Universal Church in its absolute and eternal totality, but in its relative and temporal totality, with the visible Church in each given moment of its historic existence. For the Church, as for the individual man, there is the invisible totality or the soul, and the visible totality or the body. The soul of man surpasses the limits of earthly existence, it survives the physical organism, and in the world of spirits it thinks and acts without the medium of a material brain; but if anyone were to draw from that the conclusion that in his

earthly existence man can get along without brains, the conclusion would hardly be granted, except perhaps in his own case!

There is another *a priori* argument used to evade the necessity for a universal fatherhood. Since the principle of fatherhood represents tradition, the memory of the past, it is thought to be enough for the Church to show true spiritual fatherhood by guarding tradition and preserving the memory of its own past. From this point of view, spiritual fatherhood would be represented solely by the great departed ancestors of the religious society, the Fathers of the Church. But why not extend this logic to particular Churches? Why are not the faithful of a parish content to find this spiritual fatherhood in the historic memory of the first founders of their parish church? Why do they also need a living spiritual father, a permanent parish priest? And why does it not completely satisfy the inhabitants of Moscow to have a sacred tradition, a pious remembrance of the first rulers of their Church, the holy metropolitans Peter and Alexis? Why do they also want a living bishop as a perpetual representative of this ancient tradition? To relegate the spiritual fatherhood of the Church to the past in the proper sense of that which has only an ideal existence for us is to misconceive her very essence and *raison d'être.* The barbarous ancestors of mankind knew better: they recognized the survival of ancestors and even made them the main object of their worship, but for the continual maintenance of that worship they required that the dead ancestor should always have a living successor, the soul of the family, the priest or sacrificer, the permanent intermediary between the invisible divinity and their actual life.

Without a single father common to the whole human family, the earthly life of the sons of Adam must remain subject to division of every kind, and unity will have only an ideal existence upon Earth. Real unity will be driven back to Heaven like the legendary Astræa; and Chaos will reign upon the Earth. In that case, Christianity would have failed; for it is in order to unify the lower world, to draw the Earth out of chaos and unite it with the heavens, that the Word was made flesh. The docetic Christ of the Gnostics, a phantom Christ, would be more than sufficient to found an invisible Church. But the real Christ has founded a real Church upon Earth and has based it upon a permanent fatherhood universally diffused throughout all the parts of the social organism, but actually concentrated for the whole body in the person of the common father of all the faithful, the supreme pontiff, the elder or presbyter *par excellence,* the Pope.

The Pope, as such, is directly the father of all the bishops and, through them, of all the priests. Thus, he is father of fathers. There is no question that the Pope is the only bishop to be called not only "brother" but also "father" by other bishops from the earliest times; and it was not only individual bishops that recognized his paternal authority, but gatherings of the whole episcopate as impressive, for instance, as the Council of Chalcedon.

But this fatherhood of the Pope in relation to the teaching Church or the clergy does not belong to him absolutely. Not only bishops, but all priests are under certain aspects the equals of the Pope. The Pope has no essential pre-eminence over a simple priest in the ministry of the sacraments, with the exception of Holy Order, in which he has no privilege above that of any other bishop. It is for this reason that the Pope calls the bishops not only his sons, but also his brothers, and is called brother by them. Thus, within the limits of the Church, properly speaking, the Pope has only a relative fatherhood, not fully analogous to the Divine Fatherhood. The essential characteristic of the latter is that the Father is such in an absolutely unique manner, that He alone is Father, and that the Son and the Spirit, while partaking in the Godhead, do not partake in the Divine Fatherhood in any manner or degree. But the bishops and priests — the whole teaching Church — share more or less in the spiritual fatherhood of the Pope. Fundamentally, there is no essential difference between this spiritual fatherhood or priestly power in the Pope and the same power as it is in the bishops; just as the power of the episcopate is the relative fullness of the power of the priesthood, so its absolute fullness is found in the Papacy.

XI

Kingship and sonship. Prophecy. The three Sacraments of the Rights of Man

IF the Papacy, after the manner of the Divine Fatherhood, must beget a second social authority, it is not that of the bishops who are fathers themselves, but an essentially filial authority, the representative of which is in no way and in no degree a spiritual father; just as in the Trinity the eternal Son is Son in the absolute sense and in no sense possesses fatherhood. The second Messianic power is Christian kingship. The Christian king, prince or emperor is pre-eminently the spiritual son of the supreme pontiff. If the unity of the Church[1] is centered and realized in the supreme pontiff, and if there is a relation of sonship between the Christian State as such and the Church, this relationship must exist really and, so to speak, hypostatically between the head of the State and the head of the Church. It belongs to the science of history to examine in the past, and to the opportunism of politics to decide for the present, the relations between the Church and the pagan State. But as regards the Christian State, it is unquestionable that it represents the second Messianic power, the Kingship of Christ, and that it is, as such, begotten in principle by the first, the universal fatherhood.

The positive mission of the Christian State is to incarnate the principles of the true religion in the social and political order. These principles are represented and preserved by the Church (in the narrower sense of the word), the religious society based upon that spiritual fatherhood which is centered in the Pope, organized in the episcopate and priesthood, and recognized by the piety of the body of the faithful. The Church in this sense is the fundamental religious fact and the one way of salvation opened to mankind by Christ. But Christ in His work, as in His Person, makes no distinction between the way, the truth and the life. And if for us the truth is based upon the teaching of the Church and the spiritual life upon the sacraments, it must not be forgotten that the foundations exist not for themselves, but for the whole structure. True and living religion is not a speciality, a separate domain, a secluded corner of human existence. Religion, being the direct revelation of the Absolute, cannot be one thing among many: it is all or nothing. The recognition of it implies its introduction into every sphere of intellectual and practical life as the

[1] [“L’État,” which occurs here in all the French editions, would appear to be a printer’s error. — *Tr.*]

supreme controlling principle, and the subordination to it of all political and social interests.

For Christ is not only Priest, but also King; and His Church must combine a royal authority with her priestly character. While reconciling fallen human nature to God through the perpetual Sacrifice, while regenerating and raising men by the ministry of spiritual fatherhood, the Church must also prove the fruitfulness of this fatherhood by bringing the entire collective life of man into fellowship with God.

In order to save the world which "lieth in the evil one," Christianity must mingle with the world; but in order that the human representatives of the divine fact, the earthly guardians and instruments of transcendent truth and absolute holiness, may not compromise their sacred dignity in the practical struggle against evil, nor forget Heaven in their desire to save the Earth, their political action must be indirect. As the divine Father acts and manifests Himself in creation through the Son, His Word, so too the Church of God, the spiritual fatherhood, the universal Papacy, must act and manifest itself externally by means of the Christian State, through the Kingship of the Son. The State must be the political organ of the Church; the temporal sovereign must be the "Word" of the spiritual sovereign. In this way, the question of supremacy between the two powers is solved: for the more each is what it should be, the greater is their mutual equality and freedom. When the State, confining itself to the exercise of secular power, asks and receives its moral sanction from the Church, and the latter, while asserting its own supreme spiritual authority, entrusts its external action to the State, there is an intimate bond between the two, a mutual dependence, and at the same time all conflict and oppression of the one by the other is excluded. When the Church guards and expounds the law of God, and the State devotes itself to the carrying out of that law by the transformation of the social order in accordance with the Christian ideal and the creation of practical conditions and external means for realizing the divine-human life in the whole range of earthly existence, then it is clear that all conflict of principles and interests must vanish to give place to a peaceful division of labor in the common task.

But if this mutual dependence of Church and State, in which stands their true freedom, is an essential condition of realizing the Christian ideal upon Earth, it surely becomes clear that this very condition of harmony and unity between the two powers exists only in idea and is unrealized in positive religion or in practical politics. The hierarchical Church, resting principally upon sacred tradition, regards religious truth mainly as an accomplished fact and stresses chiefly the primary datum of revelation. From this point of view the incarnation of Christ, the reality of the God-Man, the fundamental principle of the true religion, is primarily an historic event, a fact of the past linked to the present, so to speak, *sub specie præteriti* by a series of other religious facts regularly produced in an unchangeable

order established from the beginning once for all, the traditional teaching reproducing the *depositum fidei,* the apostolic succession being transmitted in a uniform manner, Baptism and the other sacraments being signified by invariable formulæ, and so on.[1] This traditional principle, this unchanging and determinate character, is absolutely essential to the Church in the narrower sense; it is her native element. But if she confines herself to this element alone and, resting satisfied with her superior origin, refuses to take account of anything outside it, she makes way for that absolutism of the State which regards religion as a thing of the past, venerable but irrelevant, and so thinks itself justified in absorbing all the living present in the politics of temporal interests.

"I am unity," says the Church, "I embrace all nations in a single universal family." "Well and good," replies the State, "let all the nations of the Earth be united in the mystical and invisible order; I am not opposed to the communion of saints nor to the unity of Christian souls in a single faith, a single hope, a single love. But real life is not like that. There the sovereign nation is supreme; its own self-interest is the ultimate goal, its principle is material power, and war is its instrument. Therefore, divide Christian souls into hostile armies, and they have only to slaughter one another upon Earth in order to realize the more speedily their mystical union in Heaven."

"I represent the unchangeable truth of the absolute past," says the Church. "Exactly," replies the semi-Christian State, "I only ask for the relative and shifting sphere of practical life. I venerate sacred archæology; I reverence the past so long as it is content to be past for good and all. I do not lay a finger on dogmas or sacraments, provided that there is no meddling with the secular matters of the moment which are my undisputed sphere: the schools, science, social education, domestic and foreign affairs. I stand for justice: *suum cuique.* A divine institution has nothing to do with all these purely human things. The heavens to God, the temple to the priest — and all the rest to Cæsar!"

But what is to remain for Christ, both God and Man, Priest and King, the Lord of Heaven and Earth? This egoistic justice, this anti-Christian divorce between the two worlds, can only be justified by a logic which stops short at the relative and abstract duality of the spiritual and the secular, the sacred and the profane, and makes no mention of the third term, the absolute synthesis of the Infinite and the finite, eternally accomplished in God and finding its accomplishment in mankind through Christ. It is the very spirit of Christianity that is here ignored, that harmony of the whole, that union which is both necessary and free, unique and manifold, the true future which fulfils the present and brings the past to life.

[1] The real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist is, of course, a living actuality, but essentially mystical and so without direct and obvious influence upon the practical and social existence of earthly humanity.

The Church and the State, the pontiff and the prince, at present distinct from and hostile to one another, can find their true and final unity only in this prophetic future of which they themselves are the necessary premises and conditions. Two different powers, if they are to achieve unity, must have a single goal which they can reach only in co-operation, each acting in accordance with its own character and with the means at its disposal. Now, the common goal of the Church and the State, of the priesthood and the kingship, is not truly represented by either of the two powers taken alone or in its specific element. From this point of view each has its own peculiar goal, regardless of the other. If the Church's only task is to maintain the religious tradition, she can carry it out alone without help from the State. If the State has only to defend its subjects against the enemy and to maintain external order through its law-courts and police, it is fully competent to do so without calling in the aid of the Christian Church. But Christ did not unite the Divine and human in His individual person, only to leave them disunited in His social body. As Priest, King and Prophet, He has given Christian society its absolute form in the trinitary monarchy. Having founded the Church upon His Priesthood and sanctioned the State by His Kingship, He has also provided for their unity and their unified progress by leaving to the world the free and living activity of His prophetic spirit. And as the Priesthood and the Kingship of the God-Man reveal His divine nature through the medium of human instruments, so it is with His prophetic office. A third principal ministry must therefore be admitted in the Christian world — the synthetic unity of the first two, offering to Church and State the perfect ideal of deified Humanity as the supreme goal of their common activity.

Nothing has succeeded in exhausting or stifling the spirit of prophecy in the universal Body of Christ. It blows where it lists, and speaks to the whole world, to priests, kings and peoples. To the guardians of tradition it says: "It is no dead and lifeless tradition that has been entrusted to you; the revelation of the living God and of His Christ cannot be a closed and sealed book. Christ is no mere fact of past history; He is, above all, the principle of the future, of free movement and true progress. You have the deposit of faith; is it so much capital to be locked in a chest or buried in the ground? If you are faithful ministers of the Lord, you will not imitate that too cautious servant of the Gospel parable; you will not reduce the teaching of Christ to a closed system. Remember that in that teaching, which is His truth, Christ is also the living principle and the cornerstone. Make Christian dogma, then, the firm but broad basis, the unchanging and yet living principle, of all philosophy and science; do not relegate it to some remote sphere, indifferent or hostile to human thought and knowledge. Theology is indeed the science of God, but the God of Christian theology is united to mankind by an indissoluble union, and the theology of the God-Man cannot be separated from the philosophy and

science of men. You are orthodox in your profession of faith, you repudiate both the heresy of Nestorius and that of Eutyches; be orthodox, then, in the application of your faith. Express the truth of Christ in terms of the Christian intellect, distinguish but do not separate His natures, preserve in your ideas and your teaching the interior, organic and living union between the Divine and the human, without confusion and without division. Beware of slipping into Nestorianism and admitting the existence of two sciences and two truths complete in themselves and independent of one another. Do not, on the other hand, attempt, in Monophysite fashion, to suppress human truth, philosophic reason and the facts of natural science and history; do not exaggerate their importance, but do not reject their decisive witness to Christian dogma; that is an unreasonable sacrifice which incarnate Reason does not ask of you and cannot accept.

"But it is not only the absolute principle of knowledge which is entrusted to you, the fathers of regenerate humanity, but also the principle of social order. And here again, as true Orthodox, you have the royal road to follow between two opposite heresies, the false liberalism of Nestorius and the false pietism of the Monophysites. The former would make a final separation between Church and State, sacred and profane, as Nestorius separated the humanity from the divinity in Christ. The latter would absorb the human soul in the contemplation of the Divine and would abandon the mundane world, its states and nations, to their fate; this is the application to society of Monophysitism, which merges the human nature of Christ into His divinity. But you, orthodox priests, who have in the true dogma of Christ's Person the infallible expression of that free and perfect union, will always maintain the intimate bond which links the human State to the Church of God, just as the Manhood of Christ is in Him linked to the Word of God. To the absolutism of the State, which tends to paganism and godlessness, you will not oppose an absolute clericalism, self-contained and complacent in its isolation; you will not combat error with a half-truth, but you will uphold that absolute social truth which demands alongside the Church a Christian State, the Kingship of Christ, the image and instrument of the divine Sonship, as you yourselves are the image of the eternal Fatherhood. You will never submit to the secular power, for the Father cannot be subject to the Son; but neither will you attempt to enslave it, for the Son is free.

"Pontiffs and priests, you are the ministers of the sacraments of Christ. In revealed dogma, Christ is the principle of all truths or of the whole truth. For truth is fundamentally one, as it is infinitely manifold in its material content, and threefold in its constituent form — theological, philosophical and scientific — just as Christ is one in His hypostasis, infinitely manifold inasmuch as He contains and manifests the ideal cosmos, and threefold inasmuch as He unites the divine substance not only with the rational soul of Man, but also with his material and

bodily nature. So in the holy sacraments Christ is the principle of life, of the whole of life, not only spiritual but also bodily, not only individual but also social. You, sacrificing priests, were created to plant within humanity the mystical yet real seed of divine-human life; you sow within our nature the seed of matter made divine, of a heavenly corporeity. The beginning of this work, the first source of supernatural life within the body of earthly humanity, must be an absolute fact surpassing human reason, a mystery. But there is nothing hid which shall not be revealed; the mystical elements implanted in human nature by the grace of the sacraments through your ministry must germinate, grow and display themselves in visible existence, in the social life of mankind which they progressively transform into the true body of Christ. This work of sanctification does not, therefore, belong only to the priesthood; it demands also the co-operation of the Christian State and of Christian society. What the priest initiates in his mysterious rite, the secular prince must continue by his legislation and the faithful people must consummate in its life."

The prophetic spirit of Christianity will say then to the Christian princes and peoples: "The Church gives you the mysteries of life and happiness; it is for you to reveal them and to take pleasure in them. You have Baptism, the Sacrament or Mystery of *liberty.* The Christian redeemed by Christ is, above all, a free man. The eternal and absolute principle of this freedom is conferred by sacramental grace and cannot be destroyed by the external relationships or the social condition of Man. But in the Christian world can these external relationships be allowed to remain in contradiction to the gift of God? The baptized Christian retains his freedom even if he is a slave, but should he be a slave in a Christian society? Banish, therefore, Christian kings and peoples, the last traces of pagan degradation, suppress slavery and servitude in all its forms, direct or indirect, for they are all the negation of Baptism — a negation which, for all its inability to destroy interior grace, none the less hinders its external realization. Our God is no hidden God; and if He has revealed Himself and become incarnate, it is certainly not His will that the contradiction between the visible and the invisible should be perpetuated. Do not, then, allow Man, whom the living God has set at liberty, to be driven back into servitude to dead things, into slavery to machines.

"You have Confirmation, the Sacrament or Mystery of *equality.* The Church of Christ communicates to each Christian, without distinction, the Messianic dignity, which the first Adam forfeited and the second restored, by bestowing upon each the sacred anointing of sovereigns. We know that the perfect condition of society which is foreshadowed by this sacrament (the state of *malkhouth cohanim — regnum sacerdotale)* cannot be immediately realized; but do not you mighty ones of the Earth forget on your part that that is the true goal of Christianity. By maintaining at all costs from selfish motives the inequalities of society, you will

justify the envious and bitter reaction of the disinherited classes. You profane the Sacrament of Holy Chrism if you turn the Lord's anointed into rebellious slaves. The law of God has never sanctioned inequalities of birth or fortune, and if in your impious conservatism you raise what is only a transitory circumstance to the dignity of an absolute and eternal principle, upon your own heads will be the sins of the people and all the blood of revolutions.

"And you, Christian people, remember that the Church, in bestowing upon you the Messianic dignity in Confirmation, in making each one of you the equal of priests and kings, has conferred upon you not an empty mockery of a title, but a real and permanent grace. It is for you to profit thereby; for by virtue of this grace each one of you can become an instrument of the Holy Spirit in the social order. Beside the priesthood and the kingship, there is in Christian society a third sovereign ministry, that of prophecy, which depends neither on birth nor on public election nor sacred ordination. It is validly conferred upon each Christian by Confirmation and can be lawfully exercised by those who do not resist divine grace, but use their freedom to co-operate with it. Thus, every one of you who will, can, by divine right and through the grace of God, wield sovereign power as truly as Pope or Emperor." [1]

Is it the fault of Christianity that this supreme right which it offers to the world is sold by the mass of mankind to Satan for a mess of pottage?

The equality in sovereignty which belongs by right to every Christian is not an equality without distinction. All have an equal dignity, each has an infinite value in the eyes of all; but all have not the same function. The unity of Christian people, founded upon the divine-human fatherhood, is the unity of an ideal family. The perfect moral equality between the members of such a family does not exclude the dutiful recognition by the sons of the primacy and authority of their father, nor the distinction of one from another by a difference of vocation or of character. Genuine and positive equality, like true liberty, is manifested and realized in that solidarity or *fraternity* which makes many to be as one. The Baptism into liberty and the Confirmation in equality are crowned by the great Sacrament of Communion, the fulfilment of the prayer of Christ, "that they may all be one, as I am one with Thee, My Father." In bringing about the unity of all His disciples in a single communion, Jesus Christ did not mean to stop short at national frontiers; He extended His brotherhood over all the nations. If this mysterious communion of the divine Body is genuine and real, we become by the real partaking of it brothers without distinction of race or nationality; and if we slaughter one another in the

---

[1] It goes without saying that the prophetic ministry can have no outwardly binding character, since its exercise is solely determined by inward and purely spiritual conditions. As the representative in human society of the absolute ideal, the Christian prophet would be inconsistent and untrue to his mission if he were to employ means suited only to an imperfect state of society.

name of so-called national interests, we are — not metaphorically, but in actual fact — fratricides.

XII

The four Sacraments of the Duties of Man

THE three Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation and Communion, by making all Christians the free, equal brethren of one another, and all the sons of God, incorporated in His only Son Jesus Christ, bestow upon them Messianic dignity and sovereign rights. Man has the right to be the son of God, for it was for this that God created him. But because he is only by right, and not immediately in fact, the son of God, Man has also the privilege of making himself in reality what ideally he is already and of realizing the principle of his being by his own act. Thus, the duties of Man flow from his sovereign rights as the conditions which he must fulfil in order to exercise his sovereignty.

Since Man is, to begin with, a son of God only in principle, his first duty is to recognize that he is not so in fact, to recognize the vast distance between what he is and what he ought to be. This is the negative condition of all positive progress, the supreme duty of Man, the duty of humility, marked by the Church in the Sacrament of Penance and Confession. Protestantism, as though to ensure in advance the impenitence of its adherents, has rejected this sacrament. But more to blame than the Protestant heretics are those false Orthodox who would confine the duty of humility to individuals and would leave the units of society, states and nations, without hope of repentance, to their vanity, pride, egoism, and fratricidal hatred. Such was not the attitude of the prophets of the Old Testament, who called upon cities, nations and rulers of states to repent. Nor was it the attitude of that unique prophet of the New Testament who in his letters to the angels of the Churches upbraided them for the public vices and sins of their communities.

At the root of all human evil, all sins and crimes both individual and social, lies a weakness, a radical infirmity which does not allow us to be in reality sons of God. It is the chaotic principle, the primordial basis of all created being. Reduced to impotence (or to pure potency) in Man, but roused anew by the fall of Adam, it has become the basic element of our limited and self-centered existence which, clinging to its infinitesimal fragment of true being, desires to make this fragment the one and only center of the universe. This self-centered assertion, which isolates and separates us from the true divine totality, can only be destroyed by love. Love is the power which makes us inwardly surpass the confines of our given existence,

reunites us to the Whole by an indissoluble bond and, by making us in reality sons of God, causes us to share in the fullness of His essential Wisdom and in the enjoyment of His Spirit. The task of love is the integration of Man and, through Man, of all created existence. A threefold union is to be achieved by (1) the re-integration of the individual Man by uniting him in a true and eternal union with his natural complement, Woman; (2) the re-integration of social Man by the re-uniting of the individual to the human collectivity in a fixed and stable union; (3) the re-integration of universal Man by the restoration of his intimate and living union with the whole of nature, which is the organic body of humanity.

Man is inwardly separated from Woman by the desire of possessing her externally in the name of a blind and irrational passion. The two are re-united by the power of true love which identifies their two lives in their absolute substance eternally fixed in God, and only admits the material relationship as an ultimate consequence and external realization of this mystical and moral relationship. It is love at its most concentrated and most concrete, and therefore at its deepest and most intense, the true basis and general type of every other love and every other union. The word of God has ordained and blessed it, and the Church perpetuates this blessing in the Sacrament of Marriage which makes true sexual love the first positive basis of the divine-human integration. For it is this sanctified love which creates the true individual elements of the perfect society, the incarnate *Sophia.*

But in order to constitute social Man, the individual element, re-integrated by true Marriage, must be re-united to the fixed collective form. The individual is inwardly separated from society by the desire for pre-eminence and external domination in the name of his own personality. He re-enters the unity of society by the moral act of renunciation, the subordination of his will, his own interests, his whole ego to the will and the interests of a superior being recognized as such. If married love is essentially a co-ordination of two equal though different existences, social love is bound to express itself by a definite subordination of social units of different orders. Here it is not the brutal egoism of Man which must be shattered by an intense emotion impelling it to identification with another being; that has already been done by sexual love. It is the individual existence which must be linked to a general hierarchy whose gradations are defined by the formal relation existing between the whole and its parts of greater or less significance. The perfection of social love cannot then consist in an intensity of subjective feeling, but in its conformity with objective reason which tells us that the whole is greater than any of its parts. The obligation of this love is therefore infringed and the realization of social Man is hindered, not only by mere egoism, but also chiefly by that particularism which draws distinctions between the interests of lower groups, to which we are more immediately attached, and those of higher and more extensive groups. When a man separates his love for the family, the trade union,

the social class or the political party to which he belongs from his love for his country, or when he is ready to serve the latter without regard to mankind as a whole or the Universal Church, he is putting asunder what God has joined in one, and is becoming an obstacle to the integration of social Man.

The type and basic reality of this integration are given in the ecclesiastical hierarchy formed by the Sacrament of Order. It is the triumph of social love, for no member of this order functions or acts for himself or in his own name; each one is ordained and invested by a superior representing a wider social unit. Here, from the humblest priest up to the Pope, the servant of the servants of God, all are absolutely free, as far as their sacred ministry is concerned, from self-asserting egoism or isolated particularism; each one is simply a distinct organ of a united social whole, the Universal Church.

But the reintegration of mankind cannot stop short at social Man. The law of death divides the Universal Church itself into two parts, the one visible upon the Earth, the other invisible in the heavens. The dominion of death is established. The heavens and the Earth are separated by Man's desire for immediate and material enjoyment of earthly reality and finite existence. Man desired to experience or taste everything by external sensation. He desired to unite his heavenly spirit to the dust of the Earth by a superficial union of mere contact. But such a union could not last; it was bound to end in death. In order to re-unite the spirit of humanity to material humanity and to conquer death, Man must be linked to the Whole, not by the sensible surface of his being, but by its absolute center, which is God. Universal Man is re-integrated by divine Love which not only raises Man to God, but by identifying him inwardly with the Godhead causes him to embrace in It all that is, and thus unites him to every single creature by an indissoluble and eternal union. This love brings down divine grace into earthly nature and triumphs not only over moral evil, but also over its physical consequences, sickness and death. Its work is the final resurrection. And the Church, which teaches this resurrection in her revealed doctrine, formulated in the last article of her creed, foreshadows and inaugurates it in the last of her sacraments. In face of sickness and the danger of death, Extreme Unction is the symbol and pledge of our immortality and of our future integrity. The cycle of the sacraments, like the cycle of universal life, is completed by the resurrection of the flesh, the integration of the whole of humanity, the final incarnation of the divine Wisdom.

THE END